

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

MEETING OF THE
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

NAPA VALLEY COLLEGE
McCARTHY LIBRARY - COMMUNITY ROOM
2277 NAPA-VALLEJO HIGHWAY
NAPA, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, JULY 25, 2013

9:00 A.M.

Reported by: Richard A. Friant

ALL AMERICAN REPORTING, INC.

(916) 362-2345

A P P E A R A N C E S

Committee Members

Michael Robinson, Chairman

Hamid Bahadori, Vice Chairman

Janice Benton

Robert Brown

John Ciccarelli

Mark Greenwood

Bryan Jones

Rick Marshall

Larry Patterson

Lt. David Ricks

Alternate Committee Members in Attendance

Rock Miller

Bill Winter

Caltrans Staff - Sacramento Office

Devinder Singh, Committee Secretary

Don Howe

Martha Styer

Caltrans Staff - Field Offices

Jerilyn Struven
District 4

A P P E A R A N C E SAlso Present

The Honorable Brad Wagenknecht
County of Napa Board of Supervisors
District 1 Representative and Chair

Sze Lei Leong
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Jaime Maldonado
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Steve Terrin
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Maurice Palumbo
Golden Gate Bridge District

Raymond Santiago
Golden Gate Bridge District

Zaki Mustafa
Los Angeles Department of Transportation

Stephen M. Pyburn
US Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

Jay Beeber
Safer Streets LA

Chad Dornsife
Best Highway Practices Institute
National Motorists Association

Ricardo Olea
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Gary Biller
National Motorists Association

Eric Widstrand
Sam Schwartz Engineering

The Honorable Adrin Nazarian
Member of the California State Assembly

A P P E A R A N C E S

Also Present

Mark Riggs
Redflex Traffic Systems

Garland Wong
City of Fairfield

Erin Riches
California State Senate Transportation and Housing Committee

Ted Link-Oberstar
California State Senate Office of Research

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Organization Items</u>	
1. Introductions	1
2. Membership	7
3. Approval of Minutes of the March 21, 2013 Meeting	9
4. Public Comments	10
<u>Agenda Items</u>	
5. Public Hearing	
13-03 Proposal to amend Section 2I.10, Travel Info Call 511 sign of the CA MUTCD - Submitted by MTC	10
13-06 Proposal to amend Section 3F.04 - Submitted by Caltrans	21
6. Request for Experimentation	
13-07 Request to Experiment with Bike Boxes - Submitted by National City	24
11-04 Experiment with Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beach (RRFB) and Circular Rapid Flashing Beacon (CRFB) - Final Report Submitted by the City of Santa Monica	27
12-19 Amendment to Item 12-19: Highlighted Shared Lane Marking - Submitted by the City of Los Angeles	27

I N D E XPage

7. Discussion Items	
13-08 Minimum Yellow Light Change Interval Timing for signalized intersections	51
13-09 Blank-out Stop or Yield signs for mid-block crosswalks	150
8. Tabled Items	
12-20 FHWA's 2009 MUTCD Revisions 1 and 2 - Engineering Judgment & Compliance Dates	--
9. Next Meeting	151
10. Adjourn	154
Certificate of Reporter	155
Certificate of Transcriber	155

P R O C E E D I N G S

9:00 a.m.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Good morning, everybody. This will be the start of our July 25th California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting here in Napa, California. Beautiful place. Like the college campus atmosphere. I was just noticing as I was walking into the campus some of the beautiful view sheds that you can see out into the hills. What a lovely campus this is.

I would like to introduce our -- actually our panel today, our committee. We'll start down on my right with John.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: John Ciccarelli, Bicycle Solutions, San Francisco, representing non-motorized travelers for Caltrans.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I'm Larry Patterson, the Public Works Director for the city of San Mateo. I am representing the League of California Cities, Northern California.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Rick Marshall, Deputy Director of Public Works for Napa County and I am representing California counties, Northern.

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I am Hamid Bahadori with the Automobile Club of Southern California.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And I am Mike

1 Robinson, Deputy Director of Public Works for the County of
2 San Diego. I represent the Southern California Counties.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I am Devinder Singh, I
4 am Secretary for the Committee.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: I am Janice Benton in
6 Caltrans Traffic Operations; I am representing the Caltrans
7 Department.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: David Ricks, Lieutenant,
9 California Highway Patrol.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Bryan Jones from the City
11 of Carlsbad representing non-motorized users of our
12 roadways.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: I am Bob Brown with AAA
14 of Northern California.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I'm Mark Greenwood; I
16 am the Director of Public Works for the City of Palm Desert
17 and I am representing the Southern California cities for the
18 League of California Cities.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And if we can just
20 go around in the audience too. Let's start with Rock.

21 (Thereupon, members of the audience introduced
22 themselves away from the microphone.)

23 ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I am Rock
24 Miller with Stantec Consulting; alternate to the Committee
25 representing non-motorized travel and alternate to Bryan

1 Jones.

2 SUPERVISOR WAGENKNECHT: I'm Brad Wagenknecht from
3 Napa County.

4 MR. DORNSIFE: Chad Dornsife, Best Highway Safety
5 Practices and National Motorists Association.

6 MR. MALDONADO: Jaime Maldonado with MTC, I work
7 on Freeway Services, Call Box.

8 MR. TERRIN: I'm Steve Terrin from MTC,
9 (inaudible).

10 MR. LEONG: I'm Sze Lei Leong, also from MTC, the
11 Call Box Program.

12 MR. OLEA: Ricardo Olea with the City and County
13 of San Francisco.

14 MR. PALUMBO: Maurice Palumbo, Golden Gate Bridge,
15 San Francisco.

16 MS. STRUVEN: Jerilyn Struven, Caltrans Traffic,
17 District 4.

18 ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Bill Winter,
19 Los Angeles County Public Works, alternate to the Southern
20 California County representative.

21 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
22 Administration.

23 MR. WIDSTRAND: Eric Widstrand, Sam Schwartz
24 Engineering.

25 MR. RIGGS: Mark Riggs from Redflex Traffic

1 Systems.

2 SPEAKER IN THE AUDIENCE: We are introducing if
3 you would like to stand up and introduce yourself.

4 MS. RICHES: Erin Riches, I'm with the Senate
5 Transportation and Housing Committee.

6 MR. LINK-OBERSTAR: Ted Link-Oberstar, Senate
7 Office of Research.

8 MR. WONG: Garland Wong, City of Fairfield.

9 MR. HOWE: I'm Don Howe with Caltrans Traffic
10 Operations.

11 MS. STYER: I'm Martha Styer, Caltrans
12 Headquarters Operations.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay, thank you.

14 And now just for some general housekeeping. The
15 restrooms, should you need them, are out this back door to
16 my left. And then there's water and some snacks if you
17 start to feel queasy like sometimes I do so they are all
18 available in the back.

19 Rick, we have some introductory remarks?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: It is my pleasure to
21 have this be the first time I am hosting the Committee here
22 in Napa and I invited the Chairman of our County Board of
23 Supervisors, Brad Wagenknecht, to address the Committee and
24 welcome us all here to what is my home.

25 SUPERVISOR WAGENKNECHT: Yes it is, it's your home

1 and my home.

2 I was riding my bike down to the office this
3 morning and, you know, I ride down the same path every day
4 and I look out and I see all the houses and the people that
5 I -- I think about the houses and the people that I know.
6 It's very nice to be in a nice, comfortable spot. As has
7 been pointed out it's a beautiful, beautiful place to do.
8 And coming down at 6:30 in the morning it's kind of peaceful
9 doing that at that point.

10 But it's nice to get out sometimes and out of your
11 -- out of your normal place and we welcome you to Napa if
12 this is not your normal place. It's Rick's and mine's. He
13 just lives a few blocks away from where I live so it's
14 Rick's and my normal place and it's our normal commute, the
15 two miles down Brown's Valley Road to -- to the office. But
16 for you, you all, it's a different spot.

17 We are in Napa and so I -- I brought a little wine
18 to share. Obviously this is not enough to share for all of
19 us. We know -- we know how to do wine in Napa, if you
20 haven't heard. And this is from the Carneros area, which is
21 in my district and it's a -- it's a -- it's a pinot noir but
22 it's done in the vin gris style, so you can see that.

23 But for whoever can guess what district this is
24 from -- Rick you're not allowed -- what district this is
25 from from the Napa Valley, I will give you my bottle of vin

1 gris. If that's all right?

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It's from the
3 best district.

4 (Laughter.)

5 SUPERVISOR WAGENKNECHT: Good answer but. And
6 don't drink this and then drive home. It likes to be
7 chilled. This is one of those that it's really nice for a
8 summer evening like we have had in the last while. Any
9 guesses?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The Carneros
11 district.

12 SUPERVISOR WAGENKNECHT: Carneros, yeah. I'm just
13 -- I'm just -- it's my supervisor district.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: District 1.

15 SUPERVISOR WAGENKNECHT: District 1, there you
16 are.

17 (Laughter.)

18 SUPERVISOR WAGENKNECHT: Welcome to Napa. Learn a
19 lot, get a lot out of it. And if you have a few minutes go
20 out to the Carneros. The Carneros is just across the river
21 this way. Most of our visitors go up Valley but the
22 Carneros is a very nice, beautiful area to visit.

23 Saintsbury is a winery that is owned by a friend
24 of mine that was my Planning Commissioner on the Napa County
25 Board but also he went to the University of California,

1 Santa Cruz where I went also so it's nice to share that.

2 But welcome to Napa and I wish you the best for
3 your day. Thank you.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you,
5 Mr. Chairman. And please, it is such a beautiful area. I
6 hope even though you live here you can still appreciate it.

7 SUPERVISOR WAGENKNECHT: I still can.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Some of these things
9 just can't be taken for granted.

10 SUPERVISOR WAGENKNECHT: That will be a good
11 picture to have here, the wine in front of traffic devices.

12 (Laughter.)

13 SUPERVISOR WAGENKNECHT: Thank you.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, just one
16 other bit of housekeeping as we commence. I just want to
17 make sure everybody knows that you do need a parking permit
18 on campus today and there are machines -- both of the lots
19 in either direction there is a machine. And it's \$2 and put
20 the permit in your dash. If you haven't done so already
21 please do. Thank you.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And I believe Janice
23 has an announcement.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yes. In honor of our
25 Chairman retiring from the Committee on behalf of the

1 department and specifically our Deputy Director for
2 Maintenance and Operations we would like to give you this
3 signed letter. It says:

4 "Dear Mr. Robinson:

5 "On behalf of the California Department of
6 Transportation and California road users I thank you for
7 your two years of dedicated and professional service as
8 Chairman of the California Traffic Control Devices
9 Committee.

10 "Your commitment to traffic safety and the
11 uniformity of traffic control devices has been an
12 inspiration to traffic engineering professionals during
13 adoption of the 2012 California Manual on Uniform Traffic
14 Control Devices your contribution was invaluable and helped
15 the Committee develop a comprehensive manual.

16 "On behalf of Caltrans and the Committee Members I
17 thank you again for your outstanding public service to the
18 road users of California. I wish you every happiness in
19 your retirement."

20 It's signed by Steve Takigawa, our Deputy Director
21 of Maintenance and Operations.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Does that signature
23 -- is it also a get out of jail free?

24 (Laughter.)

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: It depends on who you

1 talk to, I think. So congratulations, Mike.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: When I made the
3 decision to retire this wasn't on the top of my thinking. I
4 wish I could have stuck around and seen more of this. The
5 last couple of years have been just amazing. You get as far
6 along as I have in your career and you think you have seen
7 and heard it all but it is not until you sit on this
8 committee that you realize that there is just so much
9 farther to go.

10 Every day is a change and this committee is -- we
11 are very fortunate to be able to sit here and witness it
12 and be a part of it. I really appreciate all the time that
13 I have been able to spend on this. It's something I'll
14 never forget. Thank you all for your support.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Thank you, Mike.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay, we'll jump
17 right in. We have got approval of minutes from the March
18 2013 meeting. Any changes to the minutes?

19 If not I would entertain a motion to approve.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I move approval.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Is there a second?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Second.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: We have a motion and
24 a second. The motion is to approve as written. All in
25 favor signify by saying aye.

1 (Ayes.)

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Any opposed?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: If I may, Mr. Chair?

4 I would just like to abstain since this is my
5 first time on the Committee.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Larry.

7 Okay, so with one abstention it passes
8 unanimously.

9 And now it's time for our public comments. Do we
10 have any members of the public that would like to speak in
11 front of the CTCDC?

12 Seeing none we will move directly into our agenda
13 items. The first item is a proposal to amend Section 2I.10,
14 Travel Info Call 511 sign of the CA Manual of Uniform
15 Traffic Control Devices. This is submitted by MTC. Rick,
16 this is your item and we've got somebody here to speak on
17 it?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Yes, another first for
19 me. This is my first item as a sponsor so I hope I didn't
20 overdo it and take it too far. But anyway, we had a preview
21 of the subject at our meeting last time. And between then
22 and now I have worked together with Sze Lei Leong from MTC
23 to develop the recommendation that is before you today and
24 he is going to present the background and recommendation.
25 Take it away.

1 MR. LEONG: Thank you, Rick. Good morning,
2 Committee Members, Mr. Chairman. My name is Sze Lei Leong
3 and I represent the Metropolitan Transportation Commission
4 here and in the Bay Area.

5 I am here to present our request for approval for
6 the modification to Section 2I.10, which is -- which
7 includes or will add the sign here that you see here,
8 "Freeway Assist Call 511." And this will coexist with the
9 existing sign that is in the Section 2I.10, which is the
10 "Travel Info Call 511" sign, so both signs will coexist.

11 Just an item for clarification. I came to the
12 Committee in March as an informational item only and one
13 question that was posed was whether this item was presented
14 in the past before. The past effort was actually by Los
15 Angeles MTA for the "#399" sign so it was actually a
16 completely separate effort. So this is the first time, as
17 you mentioned, this is the first time that we're presenting
18 this item.

19 Secondly, before I move on to my presentation is
20 you should have in front of you an amended version of the
21 text in the MUTCD. Let me know if you don't have it. But
22 this is what supersedes what you have in the agenda. But I
23 will also have it in the presentation here.

24 What I want to give you is a preview of or an
25 overview of the Call Box Program because this sets the --

1 this will give some context on why we are recommending our
2 proposal.

3 The Call Box Program in the Bay Area consists of
4 just about 2,000 call boxes and it is paid for by the --
5 when we register our vehicles, \$1 of which goes to pay for
6 this program as well as other motorist services or motorist
7 information programs like the Freeway Service Patrol
8 Program.

9 We receive just about 50 to 60 daily calls from
10 the Call Box Program. Back starting in 2008 we started
11 allowing cell phones to call 511 and to request freeway
12 assistance. So essentially users who are using cell phones
13 and people who are calling at the call boxes, they
14 essentially get brought into the same call answer center for
15 the same type of service. And that service is roadside
16 services, including FSP, or private auto club including AAA
17 or CHP rotational tow.

18 Now it is probably no surprise that cell phone
19 usage has gone up and call box call volume has decreased.
20 So staff has developed a plan to address this trend.

21 This slide here, the next one, it's a little small
22 but in summary, there is a line here that shows where --
23 what we have done in the past and what our plan is intended
24 to do right here. This red line shows the number of call
25 boxes where we started back in 2001, 3300 call boxes, down

1 to 2200 call boxes here. This line shows the trend of
2 reduced call volumes from the call boxes and this blue line
3 shows the gradual increase of freeway assistance calls or
4 calls from using a cell phone.

5 Now the plan that I am talking about, the
6 reduction plan, is this line right here. Which in 2013 is
7 going to have a reduction of just about a total of 500 call
8 boxes, 430 of which are within urban areas. So the
9 reduction plan is to reduce this -- as a result of -- it
10 causes this here, a reduction in call boxes, but also
11 eventually a reduction in call boxes within the urban areas.

12 Probably most, if not all, the urban call boxes, with the
13 exception of bridges, tunnels and tubes.

14 Now the point that I want to show here is that
15 while we are reducing call boxes we need to maintain a
16 lifeline system for the public motorist to be able to call
17 for help, hence the 511 freeway assistance program.

18 So where do we stand in terms of this reduction
19 plan? Well, this reduction plan began back in 2011 where we
20 involved or joined in with our partner agencies, CHP and
21 Caltrans, to refine this reduction plan. And so the outcome
22 of this reduction plan was a list of call boxes that we went
23 through extensive research to determine which call boxes to
24 remove. So essentially it's every other call box for this
25 first phase. This plan, again, it's a multi-phase plan

1 where in the first phase we remove every other call box and
2 then later on we'll remove call boxes in corridors and then
3 eventually most, if not all, urban call boxes.

4 So what does this plan look like visually? This
5 map shows -- it's difficult to see but every dot represents
6 a pair of call boxes. And as you see the call box is
7 distributed throughout all nine county areas, it covers all
8 major highways and freeways and it is also on a few county
9 local roads here.

10 Now what I'll do is zoom in to that area, the
11 680/580 interchange, to give you an idea of what the first
12 phase of this reduction plan will result in. Each of those
13 pair of dots is a call box and there is a number that
14 denotes what that call box number is. For example, AL-580-
15 238. So it's Alameda, Highway 580, post mile 238, for
16 example.

17 So this is what exists currently. There are
18 supposed to be red dots representing the call boxes that we
19 will be removing and in place installing these 511 Freeway
20 Assist signs on the existing call box poles. So what the
21 driver will see is a sequence of call box and a freeway
22 sign, call box et cetera. And currently it would be spaced
23 between one to two miles. So that's Phase 1, which is for
24 2013 and into 2014.

25 Subsequently, Phase 2 and 3, this is several years

1 down the line. What we intend to do is remove the urban
2 call boxes and leave the freeway assist signs. So the
3 spacing for that will be about -- about three miles or
4 longer.

5 So we anticipate about 430 signs to be installed
6 within urban areas. And to make sure that the wording
7 "Freeway Assist" is the most applicable and direct way of
8 describing the service we were -- we took the advisement of
9 Caltrans staff to go through some focus groups and surveys
10 to make sure of what is that wording that we want to name
11 this program, this program to call 511 and to receive
12 freeway assistance. We did conduct several focus groups
13 beginning in March and concluding in June and some surveys
14 just to make sure that the wording is accurate. So in
15 conclusion, "Freeway Assistance" is the wording that most
16 accurately depicts the type of service that we offer through
17 the 511 service.

18 Given that, what I show here is in Section 2I.10,
19 our recommendation to add to the section our Freeway Assist
20 Call 511 sign. On the left is what is currently in the --
21 in the Manual and on the right is what we propose in
22 addition to this.

23 So the final sign layout, what is intended to be
24 done is to mirror closely the specifications of the Travel
25 Info Call 511 sign. And we will work with Caltrans

1 representatives to make sure that the signs are within
2 specification. What is different is the logo, which is our
3 local logo, 511 logo that we use when in the Bay Area, the
4 wording. And here you will see that what we propose is the
5 call box numbering scheme.

6 Now that is what we use here in the Bay Area for
7 CHP and for our call center to locate the motorist wherever
8 they are. So they'll call 511. And if they happen to be
9 near that sign they can tell that sign number and they will
10 be able to find out where they are. Now we are open to
11 another way-finding number if this Committee desires or
12 removing that number altogether. But our recommendation is
13 to have a way-finding number to help the stranded motorist
14 be located in a more efficient manner.

15 So what do these signs look like in the field?
16 Well what we have done is -- these photographs were taken in
17 Los Angeles but we superimposed the "Travel Info," this sign
18 here, onto this pole and that sign here. So in Los Angeles
19 there are "Travel Info Call 511" signs on call box poles and
20 so we superimposed the "Freeway Assist Call 511" sign to
21 give an idea of what it will look like here. Los Angeles
22 currently uses a 54x72 sign so our recommendation is to use
23 a sign up to 54x72 in terms of dimensions.

24 Now this pole has a breakaway unit in case there
25 is a knockdown. And speaking of which, maintenance, MTC

1 will continue to maintain these signs. If there is a
2 knockdown or if there is general maintenance there will be a
3 provision in our call box maintenance provider to continue
4 to maintain these signs here.

5 Here is another example of the sign superimposed
6 on a Los Angeles "Travel Info Call 511" sign. Here is
7 another one. And a final one.

8 So my last slide here, I think we'll have to rely
9 on the printouts. I leave you here with the text that we
10 recommend amending to 2I.10. The text in black refers to
11 the "Travel Info Call 511" sign that currently exists in the
12 MUTCD and the text in red is what we recommend adding to the
13 section.

14 On the right depicts the added sign next to the
15 "Travel Info Call 511" sign and next to it is the "Freeway
16 Assist Call 511" sign, which we are recommending calling
17 SG-49B.

18 In summary, the text in red essentially mirrors
19 the text in black with the exception of the fact that we
20 will change the service name from "Travel Info" to "Freeway
21 Assist Call 511." And lastly, an allowance for an
22 identification number, or say a call box number or some
23 other way-finding number.

24 So in summary, we are removing call boxes but we
25 want to keep a lifeline out there for motorists to maintain

1 safety and to have a way to call 511 for the aid that they
2 need to get on the freeways.

3 So with that I will leave for any questions that
4 you may have.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

6 MR. LEONG: Thank you.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: With that I will
8 open the communication up to the Committee. Any questions
9 or comments? Hamid.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I have just one
11 question. The 511, I assume the phone line itself is live
12 all the time, that's 24/7, right?

13 MR. LEONG: It is live, yes, 24/7.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: But the Freeway
15 Service Patrol is not full time, right?

16 MR. LEONG: Freeway Service Patrol operates mainly
17 during commute times, yes.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: During the
19 commute hours. Because the way that it operates, usually
20 from the call boxes now. When people call the first
21 question the operator asks is, are you a AAA member? And if
22 they say yes they route the call directly to our dispatch
23 center, they don't follow-up anymore. They just send it to
24 our dispatch center and then our operators handle it like
25 any other call.

1 So this is -- the only question that I asked you
2 last time was when you say "freeway assist call 511" it may
3 leave the impression that the towing is available full time.

4 MR. LEONG: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Which is not
6 true.

7 MR. LEONG: For the Bay Area our dispatchers will
8 have a list or a schedule of what services are available.
9 And if it does fall within FSP hours they will, in some
10 cases, dispatch FSP. But in most cases FSP, there is a --
11 FSP is roving during the commute hours so oftentimes during
12 those times FSP will reach the stranded motorist first. But
13 if it is beyond, if it is beyond commute hours, whatever
14 other available service there is, AAA --

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Either they
16 send it to us or they go to the rotational program that --

17 MR. LEONG: The rotational, yes.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Other
19 questions or comments?

20 Seeing none we will open the communication out to
21 the public. Is there anyone? Please come up and -- come on
22 up.

23 MR. PALUMBO: Good morning. My name is Maurice
24 Palumbo, I work with the Golden Gate Bridge in San
25 Francisco. But I am primarily, like John, on the National

1 Committee of Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

2 So my question was, the image that had the two
3 logos. Oh, thank you. The logo on the left is a national
4 symbol, whereas the 511 logo on the right, as I think you
5 pointed out, is a Bay Area symbol. So is the proposal to
6 amend the California MUTCD with the Bay Area symbol or is it
7 just the national symbol and then where you happen to be you
8 have that flexibility to use what's appropriate in your
9 jurisdiction? That was my question, thank you.

10 MR. LEONG: Thanks for the question. I believe in
11 the text it describes the ability for the local
12 transportation agency to use their local 511 logo.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay, so for
14 clarification, this would be for modification to the
15 California MUTCD.

16 Okay, any other questions or comments?

17 Then we'll bring it back to the Committee. If
18 there are no additional questions/comments I would entertain
19 a motion.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I will
21 move approval of this item as recommended.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: As presented.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Motion made by Rick.
25 Do we have a second?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I'll second.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Second, Mark
3 Greenwood.

4 Any additional comment or questions?

5 Then I'll ask for the vote. All in favor of
6 approving this modification indicate by saying aye.

7 (Ayes.)

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Any in opposition?

9 Hearing none this motion passes unanimously, thank
10 you.

11 Okay, the next item on our agenda is a proposal to
12 amend Section 3F.04, which was submitted by Caltrans. And
13 Janice, I think you have a comment on this.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yes. This item came to
15 us from Mr. Bill Winters. For Section 3F.04 there is a
16 specific section in the standard, and this is a standard
17 under the California portion that requires -- that requires
18 the nighttime inspection to ensure that there are no
19 confusing or misleading delineators. It is under the
20 Guidance section.

21 And just the history of this particular language
22 was carried forward from the traffic manual so it's several
23 years back.

24 And so there has been a recommendation to remove
25 that particular guidance statement.

1 We queried our district folks and confirmed that
2 not in all cases that we do a nighttime inspection following
3 the placement of the delineators.

4 So we are supporting the recommendation, carrying
5 this forward to amend the traffic manual, the language in
6 the manual.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Janice.

8 Bill, I know you were the proponent for this,
9 would you like to come up and speak to it?

10 ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Good morning,
11 Committee, and thank you, Janice, for bringing this item
12 forward.

13 Besides just pointing out what was mentioned about
14 the nighttime inspection you will note that on page 13 of
15 the Revised Agenda the other change being made here is to
16 delete the standard statement about placing them on state
17 highways, as well as a guidance statement saying that they
18 should be placed on all city and county roads.

19 I think, as the Committee knows, there has been an
20 effort to collapse those kind of statements and just apply
21 them uniformly to any public road. And certainly allowing
22 engineering judgment to come in. I believe there is
23 sufficient guidance in the standard language elsewhere in
24 this particular part of the manual.

25 And as far as the inspection goes, if there is any

1 concern with that, there is other language in the manual
2 about maintenance of your markings and a delineator is a
3 type of marking. So it seemed logical to just use the
4 default language as far as the maintenance goes that is
5 already contained elsewhere in the manual.

6 There is proposed rulemaking and there is a --
7 that hasn't been finalized. There is a placeholder in the
8 manual today for retro-reflectivity of markings that
9 eventually it is anticipated that a federal standard would
10 be created for retro-reflectivity of all markings. SO my
11 expectation would be that at that time that the rulemaking
12 is perfected that some language would be in it to deal with
13 delineators since, again, it is just another type of
14 marking. And that is all I really have on that. Thank you.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Bill.

16 Okay, we will open this up to the Committee. Are
17 there questions or comments relative to the item?

18 Seeing and hearing none we will open to the
19 audience. Are there questions or comments from the public?

20 We are making this too easy. This is very, very
21 easy.

22 Seeing none from the public we will bring it back
23 to the Committee. if there are no additional questions or
24 comments I would entertain a motion.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: If it makes

1 sense it makes sense. I make the motion to pass the item as
2 proposed.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Hamid.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I'll second the
5 motion.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And Janice
7 seconds for approval of the changes.

8 And I have to agree that these changes make it
9 easier for local agencies to understand what they can do on
10 their own roads. Elimination of the state highways-type
11 wording eliminates the possibility of local agencies from
12 being confused and missing out on an opportunity to use
13 these types of signs.

14 So we have a motion to approve and a second. All
15 in favor say aye?

16 (Ayes.)

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And opposed?

18 This motion carries unanimously.

19 We are going to move down now into our requests
20 for experimentation. We have a request to experiment with
21 bike boxes submitted by National City and this was
22 introduced by Mark Greenwood. Is there anyone from National
23 City here?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I don't believe so.
25 And I have reached out to them in various ways on numerous

1 occasions and have never made contact with National City so
2 I believe we should table this item permanently and not re-
3 agendize it until we can make contact to discuss it.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay, Mark. Since
5 this is your item you can certainly do that and we will --
6 since there is no one here to speak to it -- John.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chair, I read
8 the request to experiment and I have some suggestions for
9 National City to consider, friendly amendment stuff, and
10 specific guidance to create a robust experiment.

11 How would be -- what would be best procedure for
12 me to do that, given that Mr. Greenwood has suggested that
13 we table?

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I think if you would
15 communicate your thoughts and opinions with Mark on that,
16 that would probably be appropriate.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And Mark will
19 probably continue to try to get with National City and then
20 he could -- he could carry those comments to them.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I am interested also
22 in my role as a member of the national committee, bicycle
23 technical committee. Bike boxes were brought forward as a
24 proposal in our June meeting just concluded and it passed
25 the Committee, in a slightly stripped-down version compared

1 to what National City is proposing, which is pretty much
2 straight out of a manual called the NACTO Urban Bikeway
3 Design Guide.

4 So I would be very interested in National City's
5 experiment illuminating which elements of the bike box,
6 which is not a single thing, it's several pieces acting
7 together, are effective in affecting bicyclist and motorist
8 behavior. And it seems like any experiment that we have
9 coming before us in California would be an opportunity to
10 hopefully shine some light on exactly which part of it is
11 affected.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Agree. And we need
13 to start working on as much uniformity as possible. This is
14 one that appeared to be a little bit -- a little bit
15 different.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It looks like it's
17 on its way to some sort of National MUTCD status, probably
18 at the next rulemaking, so anything we can do between now
19 and then would be helpful.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you, John.
21 Larry?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: If it's not -- again,
23 I'm new so I am not sure if this is normal procedure. But
24 in that communication with Mark it would be nice if we were
25 copied on that just so the other committee members are aware

1 of what recommendations were made so if it does come forward
2 we have that information.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: That would be good.
4 Mark, would you please --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Sure.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: -- go ahead and let
7 us know, once you have made contact. And indicate what
8 John's comments were as well. Thank you.

9 Okay, so Item 13-07 has been tabled for now.

10 And Item 11-04 is one that we are going to -- I
11 understand we are going to pull it, we are going to defer it
12 into the next meeting.

13 Devinder, do you have any comment on that one?

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Sam, he said he cannot
15 attend the meeting so he will attend the meeting in Southern
16 California so we will put it on the agenda next meeting.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: So there is no one
18 here to speak to that one?

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: We will pull this
21 and it will be deferred into the next meeting.

22 The next item on the agenda is an Amendment to
23 Item 12-19, Highlighted Shared Lane Marking. This is
24 submitted by the City of Los Angeles and I think I see Zaki
25 out here.

1 By the way, Zaki, you came in a little bit late
2 after introductions. Zaki Mustafa is our International
3 President of Institute of Transportation Engineers. Zaki.

4 MR. MUSTAFA: Thank you very much. Good morning.
5 Congratulations on your retirement.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

7 MR. MUSTAFA: It must be a good feeling. I can't
8 wait.

9 I would like to thank the Committee for accepting
10 this proposal at the very, very last minute. I mean, it was
11 really poor planning in a lot of ways but there was
12 something that I could not control. This is something that
13 has been going on for about a year now.

14 We started this green bike lane experimental
15 project on our Spring Street last year in June of -- or May
16 of 2012 and it went from Cesar Chavez all the way to Ninth
17 Street. There was going to be a press conference held and a
18 big deal about this and it is a big deal for the city.

19 We went ahead, painted the street, had our press
20 conference, but within a month the paint went away. I mean,
21 it disappeared. So lo and behold we said, hey, it could be
22 the weather was not right, you know. It was kind of cloudy
23 and we worked all night because we were working on two
24 streets. We had First Street and also Spring Street, both
25 streets totaled about two miles.

1 So we got the crew together again and decided,
2 we're going to go out there and repaint this whole thing.
3 So we started on Spring Street, starting on Cesar Chavez,
4 and that day it was sunny, we worked on it in the middle of
5 the day. And we went all the way from Cesar Chavez to Ninth
6 street. We had all our crews out there and it looked
7 fantastic. It was so bright, it was beautiful, just like my
8 Mountain Dew cap. That's where I got the color from. I
9 took my Mountain Dew cap, took it to Home Depot and I go,
10 mimic this. And I said the same thing to Ennis Paint about
11 three years ago. So it came out really nice. But again
12 within a month it went away. It was pathetic. We couldn't
13 blame it on the weather this time.

14 So I took the guys from the Bureau of Engineering
15 and our field crews out there to look at what is it that we
16 are doing wrong? I mean, we know how to paint our streets,
17 we, have been doing it for years. It's not thermal plastic,
18 it's Home Depot paint, but still it's paint, so what's
19 wrong?

20 So after looking at the pavement condition we
21 found out that just like at your home -- how many of you
22 have painted? If you don't prepare your surface and you
23 paint something that paint doesn't last, no matter what it
24 is. So it was the surface. The surface was really in sad
25 shape.

1 But the very first day when I had painted this
2 stretch our bicycle coordinator -- not bicycle coordinator
3 -- pedestrian coordinator. She's blonde and she had an
4 orange dress on and I took her out there and I was taking a
5 picture of her. And I noticed something on that picture,
6 her whole body was green, her hair, the face, the bright
7 orange dress and everything. So that kind of worried me a
8 little bit because that was the area where all the filming
9 was done in the downtown area.

10 So this time we're going to prepare the surface
11 from Spring Street all the way to Ninth Street by hydro-
12 blasting, grinding or B-blasting and then we're going to
13 repaint it, the whole stretch. So we let everyone know in
14 that area. And the filming industry came to us and said,
15 hey, hold it, you can't paint between Third and Ninth
16 because we do all our filming there and we can't take that
17 green out.

18 Of course there was a lot of articles and blogs
19 about, it's easy to take the green paint out. I mean, in
20 the computer age you can do anything. But I realized what
21 they were saying because you can't really take the
22 reflection off. You can take the actual color off but it's
23 really hard to take away that reflection that's getting on
24 the vehicle or the people that are standing on the paint.
25 So we worked with the mayor's office and we said, all right,

1 we are not going to do anything between Third and Ninth;
2 that was last year.

3 So we went ahead and prepared the surface between
4 Cesar Chavez and Third Street. I used seven different
5 materials, including the Home Depot paint which is only
6 about 9 cents a square foot, and the stain, and as of
7 yesterday, I'm sure it's there today, all seven different
8 types of material are still intact. So that tells you right
9 there preparation was a key.

10 So now about a month and a half ago, about two
11 months ago, the community, the bicycle advocate and the film
12 industry wanted us to do something between Third and Ninth,
13 which we haven't touched. And you still have a little bit
14 of green out there and it looks really bad. So we have been
15 meeting back and forth with them along with the film
16 industry and tried to come up with a compromise. The film
17 industry really did not want us to paint the solid green,
18 the bicyclist community wanted the solid green. The film
19 industry wanted the dark, dark green, the bicycle community
20 wanted my Mountain Dew green, I wanted my Mountain Dew
21 green.

22 So we really got the Council office involved with
23 it and we worked with them for almost a month and then we
24 came up with this compromise on the right. Basically all of
25 the conflict zones and the area where we are going to be

1 putting in a right turn only rule have the solid green but
2 everywhere else it will be two four-inches of green stripe.

3 Now this will save the city a tremendous amount of
4 resources and money and it will be a lot easier to maintain.

5 And the film industry is okay with it. We are going with a
6 different, a little darker green but the most important part
7 of it, we are still getting our retro-reflectivity. And I
8 feel retro-reflectivity is very, very important. The
9 coefficient of friction is something also that is very
10 important to me. And I tested the material that we are
11 going to be using and it does have the minimum coefficient
12 of friction that is required, .06, that we are looking for.

13 So basically we are asking for your approval in
14 this little deviation, minor deviation from solid green to
15 two four-inches of green. Basically meeting the needs of
16 the community. And that's what we should be doing, really,
17 looking and listening to what they are asking for and trying
18 to work with them to come up with a solution for everyone.

19 Thank you everyone for your time.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Zaki.

21 Okay, we'll bring it to --

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Mustafa?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: A question from
24 Hamid?

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, just one

1 question. So this deviation is only for this specific
2 location in the City of Los Angeles or it will be allowed
3 anywhere?

4 MR. MUSTAFA: Well, I'm glad you brought that up.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I mean, is your
6 request -- is your request for deviation from the project or
7 an amendment to the experimentation process?

8 MR. MUSTAFA: I would like to see if we can use it
9 everywhere else. But what I would like to do is, try to use
10 the fluorescent green, the brighter green everywhere else.
11 But, you know, you have to see where the community is -- I
12 mean, we have requests from other communities that want the
13 solid green but the maintenance is a nightmare. That's a
14 big issue. I mean, you're looking at a cost of almost \$10
15 to \$11 per square foot when you're doing solid green, that's
16 a lot of money. I'm asking for everywhere.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So this will be
18 your proposed lanes on the right, that will be the new
19 allowed design for any bicycle lane in California, right?

20 MR. MUSTAFA: Well, in our city.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Not in your
22 city. When we put in MUTCD --

23 MR. MUSTAFA: Right, right, everyone.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: -- it's
25 everywhere in California.

1 MR. MUSTAFA: Right, right, right, right, correct.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: For clarification, is
3 this item still under experimentation so it's not --

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That is true.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: -- it's not part of the
6 manual at this point.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: But if he --
8 but if he --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: One at a time,
10 please.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sorry.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Janice.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: So it is not part of the
14 manual at this point, it's approved for experimentation.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So if he --

16 MR. MUSTAFA: So this --

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You are
18 requesting to amend your own experimentation.

19 MR. MUSTAFA: Correct.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: So this is an
22 experiment and there will be criteria that this
23 implementation will be measured against; am I correct?

24 MR. MUSTAFA: Correct.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay. And it will

1 probably be good -- I'd be interested in knowing what those
2 criteria are. I know we've got a couple of other questions
3 but can you go into any detail on the type of criteria that
4 you are going to be comparing this implementation with?

5 MR. MUSTAFA: Well, we do have -- we are in the
6 process of getting a consultant on board to see the usage
7 and has the usage increased. And we are actually going to
8 be surveying or taking to the bicyclists themselves to see
9 which one they feel more comfortable in using.

10 Also, you know, where we have the solid green, I
11 see vehicles going through it all the time. And we need to
12 do some study to see how are we setting the behavioral
13 pattern for the drivers, both the bicyclists and also the
14 vehicles out there and do counts to see, is there any usage
15 increase in the bike lanes.

16 I am thinking about taking that, the four-inch
17 line on Vermont. Vermont we have a bike lane already and we
18 do have counts right now for as to the number of bicyclists
19 out there. And I do want to try that on Vermont as well.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: John, I saw your
21 hand first.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah. I'm curious
23 why this needs to be experimented with at all? And I --
24 This is actually a question for Caltrans. FHWA issued
25 Interim Approval Memo 14 a couple of years ago which allowed

1 the use of green pavement color to enhance the white
2 pavement markings that are part of the bike lane scheme,
3 only where the white was present. So for example, on the
4 right hand diagram, the proposed lanes, anywhere that
5 longitudinal white is present, green could be applied under
6 FHWA interim approval. FHWA didn't really specify that the
7 green had to be solid between the white lines.

8 MR. MUSTAFA: Right.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So it seems to me
10 that Los Angeles' modification to use longitudinal green
11 with their pavement in-between the left and right side bike
12 lanes still follows interim approval. So I don't see any
13 element here that really needs experimentation.

14 That is my first question for Zaki is, what aspect
15 of this needs experimentation? But really before asking
16 that question I need to ask Caltrans whether Caltrans, and I
17 don't know the history on this, the way interim approval
18 works is that it is a memo from FHWA offering local agencies
19 and/or states to allow the use of a treatment, a traffic
20 control device, within their jurisdiction simply by applying
21 to do so with Federal Highway.

22 And earlier interim approval on rapid-flashing
23 beacons, Caltrans took the step after it was satisfied that
24 there were multiple sources, vendor sources, of a blanket
25 approval statewide. So my question for Caltrans was, what

1 is the California status of approval statewide for FHWA's
2 Interim Approval Memo 14, green pavement color to highlight
3 bike lanes.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Janice?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: My understanding is we
6 provided that approval.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. I didn't
8 think to ask before that. Since you've give that --

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We do have -- we do
10 have statewide blanket approval to use green pavement in the
11 bike lanes.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. So the
13 question to Zaki is, what aspects of the treatment require
14 experimentation?

15 MR. MUSTAFA: In my opinion, none.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

17 MR. MUSTAFA: Because FHWA does not tell you that
18 you could have it for four feet, three feet or one feet. It
19 says green --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

21 MR. MUSTAFA: -- within the white. But I wanted
22 to come visit Napa and see you.

23 (Laughter.)

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I wanted to -- I
25 wanted to follow up on the design.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: John.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I teach professional
3 development classes for Caltrans, LADOT, LA County Metro and
4 some other agencies. And the emerging use of green is
5 interesting to me and there are quite a few different
6 variations on the treatment in the greater Los Angeles area,
7 which is the last place I thought the course for Metro's
8 bike program.

9 And if I had to distinguish between the
10 predominant ways it is being applied I would say one is more
11 of what I call "solid color," which is within the mid-block
12 area and the storage area, as shown on the left, it's solid
13 and within the transition area between mid-block and storage
14 it's dotted, okay. Dotted is the terminology for what we
15 use in the interrupted area indicating a conflict area. It
16 seems to me like the treatment on the right is just -- it's
17 preserving the use of the green in the conflict area that is
18 the transition area between mid-block and storage. It's
19 minimizing the use of green but still giving a hint of it as
20 a lead-in of the mid-block section and a lead-in of the
21 storage section. Is that a conscious design on LA's part?

22 MR. MUSTAFA: Yes.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay, good.

24 MR. MUSTAFA: The community -- the bicycle
25 community also wanted all the driveways to be solid. But

1 then again, when we put it up it looked like the whole block
2 was green.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

4 MR. MUSTAFA: So we had to compromise. I mean, we
5 had meetings with them for hours and hours and days.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

7 MR. MUSTAFA: And this is the final compromise.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: John, I want to get
9 to Mark. Mark.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Thanks, that answers
11 my questions.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: If Zaki and the City
13 of LA are confident and comfortable that what they're doing
14 isn't really an experiment I'd like to thank the City of LA
15 for keeping us apprised of their work here and I think we
16 should discontinue this discussion.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

18 And my comment would be, I think there is
19 something that can be learned. As I was mentioning before,
20 if we do have some criteria that you can measure against --

21 MR. MUSTAFA: Right.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: -- perhaps a
23 comparison of what's marked under current lanes versus
24 proposed lanes. Surveys of bicyclists, surveys of
25 motorists' understanding of what these markings mean.

1 The first thing I thought of was, you don't have
2 any issue with the coefficient of friction --

3 MR. MUSTAFA: Correct.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: -- on the right hand
5 side --

6 MR. MUSTAFA: That's right.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: -- versus on the
8 left hand side. So those kinds of things I think could be
9 measured and some valuable information could be gleaned from
10 it if the City would care to go into that.

11 MR. MUSTAFA: I am going to be doing an experiment
12 on that, a study, especially on the coefficient of friction.

13 Now this is off-topic. Thermal plastic, the hot
14 tape, over time will get really smooth, versus your two-part
15 epoxy where the corundum is still sticking up.

16 Next Wednesday before we go to Boston for our ITE
17 annual meeting, those of you who are attending, we are going
18 to be doing an experiment and getting the readings on this
19 material.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: John.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah. Back to the
22 diagram for just a minute. Actually to the original
23 diagram. Zaki, I am particularly interested in the
24 behavioral effectiveness of the lead-in treatment at the
25 start of the block. So even though because interim approval

1 is blanket statewide at this point, you don't need to
2 experiment, the little variations that you are doing here
3 are of great interest to me. That would be number one.

4 And number two, the driveway treatments. I
5 really think that shedding more light on how that affects
6 behavior at driveways would be a good thing.

7 MR. MUSTAFA: Okay.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Now, the treatment
9 on the left has a buffer.

10 MR. MUSTAFA: Right.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Where the treatment
12 on the right doesn't. And I have to say that comparing
13 buffer markings, which are in a real state of flux right
14 now, how do you buffer a bike lane? LA -- I was confused by
15 LA's buffer markings when I compared them to San
16 Francisco's. I am not playing San Francisco, where I live,
17 against LA, I'm just trying to figure out what -- What
18 confused me was they are so big and so rectangular that I
19 thought they were indicating driveway openings when I first
20 rode and drove a street.

21 And if you look at San Francisco's equivalent
22 marking, what they do is they use a diagonal stripe, kind of
23 like half of the gore marking, and they use a longitudinal
24 stripe that has a different frequency that is out of sync
25 with the diagonal stripe. So the two markings interact in a

1 way that leaves it looking permeable but still very, very
2 clear. So if you have a chance while you're up here check
3 out several of the buffered bike lanes in San Francisco such
4 as Alemany Boulevard, Market Street, Laguna Honda.

5 MR. MUSTAFA: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And see what you
7 think.

8 MR. MUSTAFA: I'll do that.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I found that as a
10 traffic control device, that particular buffer marking was
11 confusing to me in terms of reading the street. What is it
12 trying to tell me?

13 MR. MUSTAFA: I'll do that. Thank you very much
14 for your input.

15 I like the lead-in. I mean, the lead-in, the bike
16 symbol there. Bang, this is a bike lane. Because right now
17 we don't have that. I mean, I've talked with -- I take a
18 bus every day.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

20 MR. MUSTAFA: And every day on Spring Street the
21 bus that I'm in, it's got different drivers, they're driving
22 in the green lane. I go, what are you doing?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

24 MR. MUSTAFA: Why are you driving in this? And
25 they go, what is this? A bike lane. Okay. So, anyway, I

1 think it's going to make a big difference.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Presumably you'll be
3 positioning that downstream of the right turn sweep?

4 MR. MUSTAFA: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay, good.

6 MR. MUSTAFA: Thank you.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: So, Mark, if you're
8 agreeable to it you could remove this as a request for
9 experimentation.

10 Yes, I'll get to you, I promise I'll get to you.

11 But that's where we're leading at this point. And
12 ultimately, if it would not be an experiment, we would be --
13 it would be nice if we got information from you at some
14 point in the future.

15 MR. MUSTAFA: You will. You will.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: With that I'll open
17 the conversation up to the public and Rock.

18 MR. MUSTAFA: Thank you again.

19 MR. MILLER: Rock Miller with Stantec Consulting.

20 John's diagnosis of this is pretty much identical to mine,
21 I didn't really feel that there was a need to experiment on
22 this. I have mentioned that to a few fellow traffic
23 engineers and there are people out there that disagree
24 strongly with that finding. It might be beneficial if the
25 Committee could take some kind of formal action to find that

1 it, in fact does not require experimentation, that it does
2 appear to be compliant with the existing wording. That
3 would settle the argument, which I think otherwise might
4 exist if you just sort of take it off your docket.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Steve.

6 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
7 Administration. I agree with Mr. Miller. There was
8 discussion about what was meant by the interim approval. I
9 would suggest that LA request clarification from our
10 headquarters on is it necessary to experiment or not.
11 Mainly so they can put the experiment question to rest in
12 the context of what they were thinking with the interim
13 approval.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

15 MR. PALUMBO: Good morning, Maurice Palumbo with
16 the Golden Gate Bridge in San Francisco. A little off-topic
17 but related, as John alluded to earlier at the beginning of
18 this discussion.

19 There is a national effort to reevaluate the
20 entire section regarding colored pavements, green for bikes,
21 reds for busses and purple for toll facilities. So I
22 actually applaud LA, the City of Los Angeles, to look at
23 these experiments and test out how all these various
24 treatments are working out because there are other
25 implications for bus lanes and for toll lanes.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

2 Anyone else from the public?

3 Then I will bring the conversation back to the
4 Committee. John.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Zaki, I particularly
6 also would be interested in any results relating to the
7 longitudinal green next to the longitudinal white.

8 And then I wanted just for the public's benefit,
9 although many of you are practitioners, to make it very
10 clear that what we are talking about is the difference
11 between Experimentation with a capital "E" and
12 experimentation with a little "e." As considered before
13 this Committee, a Request To Experiment, RTE, is a formal
14 process for evaluating something that might make its way
15 into the manual. Experimentation absent that consideration
16 is still a good thing if the details of a treatment are in
17 flux in the practice.

18 For example, the elements of LA's proposed
19 treatment there, the longitudinal green next to longitudinal
20 white, there isn't anything like that. It's allowed by the
21 FHWA's memo but we really don't know about its
22 effectiveness. So to the extent that you want to continue
23 non-MUTCD-related experimentation on it, I feel like it has
24 the potential to inform future MUTCD content, perhaps
25 including option statements and figures. So bring it on.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Any other comments
2 or questions from the Committee?

3 Seeing none I would entertain any form of motion
4 that this Committee would have on the item.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I
6 would like to make a motion that the Committee finds that
7 either the current lanes proposed or the proposed lanes as
8 suggested by the City of LA in their request for
9 experimentation, or already approved under FHWA approval
10 process, and they do not need any further review or approval
11 by this committee.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you, we have a
13 motion on the floor. Is there a second to that motion?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Second.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: There is a motion
16 and a second to make a finding that both of the lane
17 configurations that are shown up on the current display are
18 within the intended parameters of the use of the green bike
19 lanes. John, you were first.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: A friendly amendment
21 to add the proviso that however we encourage the City of LA
22 to continue to test the effectiveness of various elements of
23 the treatment such that we may be informed for future MUTCD
24 content.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Absolutely.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And seconder?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Second it.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Larry.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I just had a question
5 of FHWA, the comment from FHWA. I wonder if the motion
6 needs to recognize that consideration by FHWA about what was
7 intended from their actions on the green pavement usage. It
8 sounded like there as a potential that they might refine
9 their directions.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I'll leave that to
11 the desires of the Committee. Should we reserve this until
12 we get a clarification from the feds or should we continue
13 with where we're going?

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I think the
15 FHWA rep may be in a better position to share his views.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Steve, would you
17 mind coming back up.

18 MR. PYBURN: I apologize, I could not hear the
19 discussion from the back.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: My question was, your
21 comments related to the previous action from FHWA and you
22 were going to review what some of the intent was for the
23 green treatment and whether or not our motion needed to
24 include some either "subject to" or some reservation about
25 that clarification.

1 MR. PYBURN: Unfortunately, I don't have the
2 interim approval in front of me. But the basis of my
3 comment was that instead of speculating that experimentation
4 may not be required, to just request that clarification from
5 our headquarters. So based on that comment, if you think
6 it's appropriate that this action not go ahead until that
7 clarification be obtained then it would be a conditional
8 approval. Just for the record, we don't have any -- we
9 support the proposal. I don't see anything really that
10 would cause concern, just, does this fit into the terms of
11 the interim approval? Since we don't write that we can't
12 make that determination.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Can I make a
14 suggestion then, perhaps. That our action be phrased such
15 that we make this finding unless we hear something contrary
16 back. So that if they are in agreement it doesn't have to
17 come back here.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: With that,
19 Mr. Chairman, what Mr. Marshall was saying is that this
20 Committee's -- our finding that they don't need request for
21 experimentation. And we can proceed with that motion as
22 amended asking for further feedback based on findings of the
23 effectiveness of material and so on and so forth. If FHWA
24 disagrees the City of LA can resubmit. But we don't need
25 to --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: So this is a -- this
2 would be a conditional approval based on an assumption that
3 FHWA is in agreement with our findings. That approval would
4 be rescinded if for some reason FHWA were to make a finding
5 in opposition to our interpretation. Is that agreeable to
6 the Committee?

7 (Affirmative nods.)

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: How about the maker
9 of the motion?

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's the
11 motion.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And the second?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Second.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay. So we have a
15 motion to approve use of both configurations. It is this
16 committee's interpretation that both are allowed under the
17 current documentation. That this is -- it is this
18 Committee's understanding that both configurations are
19 agreeable as they're written. And this approval is subject
20 to FHWA intervention -- interpretation to the negative of
21 what we are discussing. Did I describe that correctly?
22 Pretty much.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: A minor point of
24 clarification, just knowing how interim approval works.
25 It's likely if FHWA were to object at all it would not be in

1 whole, it would be to some element of the treatment. And
2 second of all, I think -- I wonder if our motion should also
3 recognize the fact that Caltrans has stated that it has
4 granted -- applied to FHWA for and been granted blanket
5 statewide approval for the use of the treatment and that is
6 the basis of our motion.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And Caltrans is in
8 agreement with that?

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We already have
10 blanket approval.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Correct.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Got it. Larry.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: And this is just
14 another minor clarification. In your restating of the
15 motion you described it as an approval. But I think what we
16 were -- what the motion was is that a finding that approval
17 is not required because of the blanket approval statewide.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: You are absolutely
19 right, I butchered it pretty badly.

20 (Laughter.)

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: It's my first time so
22 I just want to be paying attention.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Approval is not
24 required, that's correct.

25 Okay, so is everyone clear on what we are voting

1 on? If you're not I'm going to ask somebody else to restate
2 it because I didn't do a good job.

3 Okay, so we'll go ahead and call for the question.
4 All in favor of the motion indicate by saying aye.

5 (Ayes.)

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Any opposed say no.

7 This motion carries unanimously, thank you.

8 Okay. We're a little better than an hour into our
9 meeting and it's probably a good idea to get up and stretch.
10 Why don't we take a ten minute break.

11 (Off the record at 10:08 a.m.)

12 (On the record at 10:22 a.m.)

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: So we'll bring the
14 Committee meeting back to order and we will be introducing a
15 discussion item. This item is 13-08, Minimum Yellow Light
16 Change Interval Timing for Signalized Intersections. And
17 this is introduced by Hamid Bahadori.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman,
19 thank you. Colleagues, I hope you don't hate me. I didn't
20 put this on the agenda for some frivolous discussion. We
21 have had these discussions extensively about seven, eight
22 years ago. But I think that there is a need to look at it
23 again for reasons that I will briefly explain.

24 The whole thing, the issue of the yellow timing
25 came about when we introduced Assembly Bill 1022 back in

1 2003, which became effective January 2004. As part of that
2 bill -- that bill had four components about the contracts
3 and the paper ticket and stuff like that.

4 One of the items, one of the four primary items in
5 Assembly bill 1022 was that any intersection that uses a red
6 light camera in California, the yellow timing must comply
7 with the minimum standards established by the State
8 Department of Transportation. And that was because of
9 abuses that we had observed and were well-documented all
10 over California for red light cameras being used as revenue
11 generators rather than as traffic safety improvements, which
12 we support their use for.

13 But when the cities came to us and they went to
14 Caltrans they said, well, your manual, which was adopted
15 from the previous traffic manual, now the California MUTCD,
16 has a table that it says "approach speed" and for each
17 approach speed it gives a value for minimum yellow timing.
18 But nowhere in the manual it says what is approach speed, so
19 how do we do it?

20 So we brought it to the committee and we found out
21 that the approach speed was being defined differently, even
22 within the same jurisdiction. Some large cities, they were
23 using approach speed differently at different locations.
24 Some places they were using 85th percentile, some places
25 they were using posted speed, some places they were using

1 posted-plus-5, so it was a garden variety of definitions of
2 approach speed.

3 So we tried to consolidate it and the Committee, I
4 think, and Devinder is going to correct me on this, I think
5 in 2004 or 2006 we brought this -- 2005 I believe.

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: 2004, 2004.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: 2004, right
8 after AB 1022 became effective.

9 And it was a long process. We spent about a year.
10 The Committee asked me to form a subcommittee, we formed a
11 subcommittee, I chaired that subcommittee. We expanded the
12 subcommittee for the first time beyond the membership of the
13 devices committee. We invited city traffic engineers. I
14 remember specifically Dave Rosemon from Long Beach was
15 there, we had like people from Al Grover, from Hartzog &
16 Crabill, people who do signal timing for a living. And we
17 went through a process of discussions based on science and
18 engineering and practicality and legal issues and logistics
19 of the inter-department coordinations, all kinds of stuff.
20 And there is a paper that is attached to the agenda on this
21 issue that I wrote summarizing the discussions of that
22 subcommittee.

23 Not the best and not the most optimum solution but
24 the only pragmatic and practical solution that you could
25 reach in those days was to define approach speed as the

1 posted speed. All acknowledging that this may not be the
2 best engineering decision, the best technical decision, but
3 for reasons that I have explained in that brief paper it was
4 decided to stay with the posted speed and let's see how
5 things work.

6 And then, as you all know, we came with an effort
7 to better establish the establishment of posted speed limit
8 on streets, which we had a long discussion and workshops and
9 it took a couple of years to do that. So that one is better
10 fixed now. However, we all know that still the posted speed
11 limit, at times, is probably 6, 7, 8 and so sadly, very
12 rarely, is maybe 9 to 10 miles below the 85th percentile.
13 So when we are using the -- when we are using the posted
14 speed limit for yellow timing of the intersections the
15 majority of the drivers, over 50 percent, might be an area
16 actually traveling at higher speeds than that. And we knew
17 that and we were aware of that.

18 And then the NCHRP report, Report 731 came out,
19 which is a very well-researched based on science and
20 engineering and field observations a lot of it, recommending
21 that not posted but 85th be used for yellow timing, for
22 reasons that are technical and are mentioned in the report.

23 At the same time Assemblyman Nazarian, who is in
24 the audience here, introduced a bill in Sacramento, Assembly
25 Bill 612, which suggests that when you use the manual table

1 102-D for the intersections that have a red light camera, we
2 add one second to those minimum values. And his intentions
3 were noble, to reduce the abuses of the red light camera for
4 revenue generation.

5 We, by "we" I mean AAA, the organization I
6 represent, we traditionally have advocated for a single
7 yellow timing methodology in California, period. Based on
8 science and engineering, based on what makes the
9 intersection the safest during that very critical period
10 when we are going from green to red.

11 However, we supported Assemblyman Nazarian's bill
12 AB 612 because we saw that as a step forward. That even
13 though it does not come up with that improved methodology
14 for yellow timing calculations for all the 36,000-plus
15 signals in California, at least it's a step forward to
16 improve and prevent and minimize the abuses at red light
17 intersection camera -- red light camera intersections, which
18 are only about 420. Imagine, 420 out of 36,000, such a
19 small number. But still we were still abuses. So we
20 supported that bill.

21 And then Caltrans entered into a discussion with
22 Assemblyman Nazarian's office and us and said, why don't we
23 discuss this where it actually belongs, in the Devices
24 Committee. And have a discussion, have them look at the new
25 evidence, scientific research and CHRP 731 and see what we

1 can do to maybe address the concerns that the AB 612 is
2 trying to address, which are like minimizing the -- not --
3 the tickets that are used only for revenue generation, it
4 doesn't have anything to do with traffic safety. And also
5 AAA's concerns and other entities' concerns to improve
6 traffic safety.

7 So the question -- I sponsored the item and put it
8 on the agenda. And the question here and I would like to
9 highlight that nobody here is asking to go to a longer
10 yellow. It's just the -- first of all the acknowledgement
11 that what we have today is not supported by the latest
12 research, which is the NCHRP 731. And second is that what
13 can we do to come up with a uniform methodology for all the
14 traffic signals based on science engineering and the best
15 safety interests of the motorists and the bicyclists and
16 pedestrians without Sacramento stepping in, and with all due
17 respect to Mr. Nazarian, legislate engineering issues.
18 Which if the Committee does not address appropriately,
19 looking at the reality and the need, which will be
20 legislated and minute traffic engineering issues will be
21 codified in the state law. Which we have always tried to
22 say that it is best decided through this committee and
23 through Caltrans' director, through either policy directives
24 or amendments to the MUTCD.

25 Anyway, with that what I would like to suggest,

1 Mr. Chairman and colleagues, is that if you agree that this
2 issue needs further evaluation -- obviously this is a
3 discussion item, we are not expecting any decisions today.
4 But if you agree that this needs further evaluation after
5 six, seven years, that we think about it. And either
6 through some form of subcommittee again or through
7 discussions by Caltrans and legislators and experts, come
8 back to this Committee soon with recommendations to improve
9 the methodology that we have now. With that I will stop.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Hamid;
11 appreciate how you framed this. And I also appreciate how
12 our legislature has identified us as a tool for helping to
13 clarify this issue and this is -- I agree, this is
14 rightfully where those kinds of things we might be able to
15 add some clarity and help to improve things as we all
16 perceive that there is a problem out there that may need to
17 be fixed.

18 So with that and in speaking to Assemblyman
19 Nazarian a little bit earlier, you mentioned that there is a
20 possible report or presentation that could be made and I
21 would offer this time to do that if you like. Otherwise we
22 can just begin a discussion of the issues so I'll leave that
23 to your discretion.

24 ASSEMBLYMAN NAZARIAN: I'll speak after this.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Fine, fine. Then I

1 will open the discussion up to our committee. You have
2 heard that we have an Assembly bill that has been proposed
3 and there are issues in it relative to how the yellow time
4 would be calculated and addressed at red light
5 intersections. Do we have comments from the Committee?
6 Bryan.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I really appreciate the
8 Assemblyman representing the community values and I think
9 that's important and he is saying that something we're doing
10 isn't jibing well with the community and so it necessitates
11 us reviewing that. And if people are getting citations
12 through our red light running camera programs, which some
13 cities in California have brought to enhance safety at those
14 intersections, but now they have been perceived or looked at
15 as a revenue source, either for a private company or for the
16 jurisdiction and an unnecessary taxation of the people, I
17 think when we look at the numbers, creating a law for 420
18 intersections out of 36,000, it's like addressing an anomaly
19 versus the norm.

20 However, if we were to work with our law
21 enforcement and say, what is the humanistic component of
22 enforcing red light and they say, well, we look at the red
23 light and we watch the car cross over the stop bar. If they
24 cross over the stop bar after it turns red then we have the
25 right to give them a citation for running a red light at a

1 traffic signal. And a human cannot look at a light and a
2 car at the same time so they have to look at the light and
3 then they have to turn their head and look at the stop bar,
4 and that takes a certain amount of time.

5 Now with cameras we have come to the point where
6 technology can work in nanoseconds where humans work in
7 tenths of seconds. And so if we can put in -- instead of
8 making all jurisdictions change yellow times and that's
9 nearly 400 local jurisdictions and all the counties in the
10 state and then the state itself, and creating an unfunded
11 mandate where we have to send all of our staff out to
12 revisit all the signal timings, which could be a pretty
13 onerous process.

14 What we could do is for the 420 red light running
15 cameras we could just say, you can't write a citation until
16 after .5 seconds of the camera -- of the red light coming
17 on. And in that such a way we are just making that
18 technology act more like a human than an instantaneous
19 technology. And then if we are finding that 80 percent of
20 the citations are written within that .5 seconds, that
21 alleviates the cameras being perceived or looked at as an
22 unfair taxation or, you know, not taking in that humanistic
23 characteristic of enforcement or driver error or driving a
24 little faster than the posted speed limit or the 85th
25 percentile. Because even with the posted speed limit or the

1 85th percentile there's still 15 percent of the people
2 driving above that speed.

3 You know, sometimes CHP comes out with an
4 announcement that they have a zero tolerance day. So if the
5 posted speed limit is 65 and you're going 66 they might
6 write you a citation. But they announce those zero
7 tolerance days. Other times they wouldn't stand a chance in
8 a courtroom very much. I know our local enforcement
9 wouldn't stand a chance at all if they write a citation for
10 one mile per hour over the posted speed limit on a
11 residential area or on a street because our traffic
12 commissioners and our traffic judges would just throw that
13 out and they wouldn't defend our local law enforcement.

14 So our local law enforcement make decisions on, is
15 it 5 miles over the posted speed limit, is it 10 miles over
16 the speed limit, is it 11, is it 15? At what point do they
17 start writing citations for somebody violating a posted
18 speed limit. And if you got pulled over for going 26 in a
19 25, you'd probably be fairly frustrated. But if you got
20 pulled over for going 35 in a 25, that's a little bit more
21 justifiable.

22 So I think when we look at this component of red
23 light running cameras. I know in San Diego County, I live
24 in a jurisdiction and work in a jurisdiction that does not
25 and will not have red light running cameras but we have

1 other jurisdictions in San Diego County that do. And in
2 fact, two or three of those cities have already started
3 removing those programs from their city because of this
4 issue of the citation and the revenue. And it's actually
5 going to a private company rather than a lot of the money
6 coming back to the jurisdiction anyway.

7 Now we have seen some benefits to safety
8 enhancements of the red light running cameras. But to
9 change how we all do signal timings or -- for a few, seems
10 like an unnecessary regulation. And so it might be easier
11 to regulate the technology that is doing the enforcement
12 rather than -- and then if you make a decision to do that
13 technology then you have to take on that additional onerous
14 to create the technology that can do a delay of .5 seconds
15 after the light turns red.

16 And that's my thoughts and opinions. I would be
17 really excited to hear what other people have to say. But
18 it seems like a simple solution to an otherwise very -- what
19 could be on the other extreme, a very onerous undertaking by
20 our entire profession.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: So just to clarify,
22 one of the things that you are bringing up is rather than
23 attaching the issue by adding yellow time, you would attack
24 the issue by identifying how far into the red the cameras
25 could be turned on for identification of the violation.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Because as an engineer in
4 my local jurisdiction, if I have a safety issue at an
5 intersection and it is brought to my attention that, wow, we
6 have had five collisions in this intersection that are
7 because of people running red lights or not having enough
8 critical decision time to decide when to stop or when to not
9 stop or my law enforcement tell me about they're writing a
10 bunch of citations, I could go out there and either increase
11 the yellow time or I could increase the red time using
12 engineering judgment to say, this is going to help relieve a
13 safety issue out there.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And we do do that
16 occasionally where we'll put in all-red time or yellow time
17 increases. We'll round up or we give something like that.
18 And so it allows me to use professional engineering judgment
19 in my jurisdiction for the local issues that are occurring
20 in my jurisdiction.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman,
22 if I may just clarify a couple of things that Mr. Jones
23 brought up.

24 On the issue of mandating any time into red. I am
25 not going to get into that. If we decide to further

1 evaluate this all those things are going to be discussed in
2 the subcommittee.

3 The jurisdictions even today on their own are
4 using .2 seconds, but they're using it on their own.
5 Introducing something into vehicle code that makes it kosher
6 and acceptable to run red within a certain amount of time is
7 going to be completely defying the intent of red light
8 violation, which is a per se, it's not a prima facie
9 infraction. And per ses, there are no exceptions.

10 And then it's going to open a can of worms. Every
11 single red light ticket that is issued by an officer is
12 going to be challenged also. That hey, such and such
13 intersection has a red light camera and I can be .5 seconds
14 or .7 seconds, whatever, into the red and I am not going to
15 get a ticket, how come I got a ticket with the officer. I
16 was .7 into the red, what's the difference? So I am not
17 even going to get into that.

18 But primarily, you know, the reason that I thought
19 that the Committee may want to look at it is more
20 importantly not only AB 612 but more importantly is the
21 NCHRP 731, which says that the yellow timing is better
22 optimized if you use the 85th percentile. And if this is
23 the engineering 300 page report that our colleague at the
24 Transportation Research Board, TRB, has put together, that
25 tells us that the way we are doing yellow timing, based on

1 posted speed limit, that at times anywhere between 5 and 11
2 miles per hour are below the 85th percentile. That might
3 not be the best way to do our yellow timing.

4 I am fully cognizant of its practical
5 implications. I am not necessarily suggesting that even if
6 there is a change that we make it mandatory that you have to
7 do it right away. But all jurisdictions at a minimum, I
8 hope, once a year they look at their signals. And those --
9 in the process of once a year looking at the signals,
10 tweaking maybe a second here or there for yellow timing, may
11 not be such a huge financial burden.

12 I don't want to get way ahead of myself. All that
13 I am saying is that basically the reason was not only red
14 light cameras, it's more important NCHRP 731. That at least
15 tells us as safety advocates for motorists, maybe the way we
16 are doing yellow timing is not the best way that it can be
17 done.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Hamid.

19 And Larry, I know that you want to speak. But I
20 did want to -- I did want to point something out for
21 purposes of this discussion. One of the earlier things you
22 mentioned, you questioned the possible use of a half a
23 second into the red for the enforcement. I would remind you
24 that in enforcing a speed limit, if we post a speed using a
25 measured 85th percentile we can use radar. We can still

1 post a speed limit and enforce it, even though -- but we
2 wouldn't be able to use radar if it wasn't based on an
3 engineering and traffic study.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Of course.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: So we have two
6 different methods of enforcing speed limits as well. So I
7 would pose that it would -- it could be just as valid to
8 consider the type of enforcement that is proposed by Bryan.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Of course.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: With that, Larry.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12 Actually, the first thing I wanted to ask is that maybe I
13 missed the history. But the way I am looking at this item
14 and the way I read the manual, it seems to me that, number
15 one, it's establishing minimums and offering an option only
16 to extend the yellow, not to decrease it. And so the
17 initial comments was, with the red light cameras, that they
18 are being set shorter than the minimum. And I, as a
19 practitioner, I worry about that because there is no
20 authority, there is no protection in terms of doing that.

21 So my assumption going in was that the engineering
22 judgment portion using the 85th percentile, which is one of
23 the criteria that can be used, is something that as a
24 practitioner I can use to extend the yellow time, that
25 doesn't allow me to shorten it. So I just want to make sure

1 I am clear in reading this if that's the case.

2 And from a practitioner's perspective I -- the
3 formula that is used in Table 4D-102 has been used for a
4 long time in terms of setting detector distances and it was
5 really described as the process to eliminate the dilemma
6 zone, where a driver has to make a decision about whether
7 they have time to stop or not. And that yellow time is set
8 consistent with the elimination of the dilemma zone, which I
9 think makes perfect sense and I think, my understanding, has
10 been supported through the research.

11 The difference between posted speed and the 85th
12 percentile, in some respects, if you look at how the speed
13 is supposed to be set, there shouldn't be a lot of deviation
14 there with the exception of specific things, schools, senior
15 centers or other things that might adjust the speed. Now
16 that has been narrowed through recent legislation so there
17 is a very limited amount of flexibility we have in terms of
18 setting the speed. So the logic is, you set the speed on
19 the 85th percentile so therefore the posted speed could be
20 used to set the yellow time. But that if for some reason
21 those differ, you have the ability to extend the yellow time
22 using the 85th percentile speed. So that logic holds
23 together for me.

24 And I would really question trying to extend
25 arbitrarily the yellow time by a second or any other measure

1 because it undermines the logic that has created these
2 connections. And so I have to think about how it's enforced
3 within the red as an interesting option. But in terms of
4 extending the yellow, that would be something I would be
5 opposed to.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: You are absolutely
7 right in what you are saying and description of the
8 identification of the dilemma zone and how we have used
9 detector setbacks and set yellow time to ensure that the
10 driver can make a safe decision whether or not to proceed or
11 to stop. And it is engineering judgment. Remember that
12 what is in the MUTCD is a minimum and engineering judgment
13 can be used to extend that if there are conditions that the
14 engineer believes would warrant that.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Hamid.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Patterson,
18 your suggestion, that would be the best solution for all
19 concerned but the reality on the ground is different. The
20 best solution is that the posted speed limit is as closely
21 established to the 85th percentile as possible. But we all
22 have been doing this for years on many, many, many
23 occasions, more than it should be.

24 The posted speed limits are controlled, justified
25 and downgraded even when not really necessary for political

1 reasons, for community pressures. City councils and mayors
2 and the county boards lean on traffic engineers. I have
3 been in those positions, you guys are in those positions
4 today. I serve on many traffic advisory committees, one in
5 the county of San Diego with Mike and his staff, and they
6 are probably the best traffic committee I have seen in the
7 state of California and I have told him many times. And
8 they go through this very clearly and very precisely.

9 But not every place is like that. I have seen
10 posted speed limits that are at 8, 9, 10 miles below the
11 85th percentile and all that you see is an engineer signing,
12 there are not conditions not readily apparent. And if you
13 ask the engineer to highlight what are the conditions not
14 readily apparent, he has no clue. He was pressured to lower
15 the speed limit.

16 In a perfect world your solution is the best
17 solution and I agree with you completely that the posted
18 speed limits shall be as close to the 85th percentile as
19 justified by the prevailing traffic. But the reality on the
20 ground on California highways doesn't support it, sadly.
21 Thank you.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Mark.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: You know, the state
24 manual and the national manual are very similar when it
25 comes to yellow change intervals, they are almost identical.

1 And I would suggest that at the hundreds of thousands of
2 signalized intersections throughout the nation this is
3 apparently adequate. So, you know, I don't think we should
4 go to messing with the yellow change interval at just a
5 regular signalized intersection.

6 I am taking by Bryan's comments that there are so
7 many signalized intersections where you would have to invest
8 a great deal of work and essentially an unfunded mandate,
9 for cities who haven't done anything wrong, that they are
10 doing their best, they are following the national manual.
11 So I would suggest that most locations are not broken and
12 don't need to be fixed.

13 Now locations with red light cameras. If a city
14 has the money to invest in red light cameras, and presumably
15 these are at our most dangerous intersections. They are
16 certainly worth a little bit more investment to determine
17 the 85th percentile speed and then apply the NCHRP formula.

18 The manuals refer to the Traffic Control Devices Handbook
19 by ITE, which relies on similar research to the NCHRP. It
20 seems like that is where we should focus, that these red
21 light camera intersections are worthy of a little bit more
22 investment up front. That if they are the most dangerous
23 intersections, taking a speed survey to find the 85th
24 percentile is not too much to invest in those.

25 So I would like to see us not be looking at every

1 signalized intersection in the state, rather these special
2 locations that supposedly are our most dangerous.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Focusing on the red
4 light camera locations.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Larry.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I guess you won't
8 hear me say that speeds are consistently set consistent with
9 the 85th percentile speed. But I would modify that
10 considerably if we are talking about locations where I want
11 to enforce that speed because where I really get constrained
12 is when I have to enforce it, particularly with radar.

13 So by, you know. I'm looking at it thinking, this
14 is the type of enforcement, not of speed, but of something
15 that is related to the speed where I am required to use
16 either the posted speed or the 85th percentile. But where
17 the 85th percentile is substantially different, I think from
18 an engineering perspective I have the obligation to use the
19 most appropriate. So if for any reason the posted speed has
20 been limited then the 85th percentile seems to make sense.

21 So I am still working within the language of the
22 manual as it exists. Maybe there would be some appropriate
23 strengthening of it, particularly as it may be specifically
24 referencing intersections that are controlled by or are
25 enforced using red light cameras. I think Mark's suggestion

1 that we narrow the focus down to those locations which are
2 using the red light cameras, because the formulas do work
3 and they are the way to apply the yellow change interval
4 methodology when you are timing a signal.

5 So I think it's down to the narrow portion. Maybe
6 the language is just making sure that the amount of
7 flexibility, certainly to go below the minimums, would be
8 clearly stated in the MUTCD. But again, it's a fairly
9 narrow requirement specifically applied to these
10 intersections and it would not include requiring some
11 additional time like a one second additional, it would
12 simply be narrowing down the flexibility that you have at
13 those locations. Much like we do if we are going to enforce
14 the speeds and the relationship to the 85th percentile.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: As I am preparing
16 for discussing this I Googled "yellow times at red light
17 controlled -- at camera controlled intersections" and I was
18 inundated by the number of studies that have been conducted
19 on them. And I read through as many as I possibly could
20 before I got indigestion. But the one thing that I found
21 was missing in each one of these -- and by the way, the vast
22 majority of them concluded that adding yellow time to an
23 intersection reduced the amount of red light running.

24 But not one of them that I was able to find was
25 able to -- none of them stated that the yellow time was

1 placed according to the manual. And that's one of the
2 things that concerned me was that there was -- the study was
3 done, it made a conclusion, but it didn't identify that the
4 additional yellow time was over and above what the manual
5 stated needed to be there to begin with. That concerns me a
6 lot that there is potentially a lot of intersections out
7 there that are timed with inadequate yellow time below what
8 the manual requires. But the fact that nobody said that in
9 their study was of great disturbance.

10 Anyone else? Larry.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: One thing I meant to
12 mention, it's just a quick -- is that at least in my city,
13 for those intersections that are enforced using red light
14 cameras. Now the police department is the one that manages
15 that contract, that's not in public works.

16 But on an annual basis, this was brought up
17 earlier in one of the suggestions, on an annual basis my
18 department is asked to certify that we are, in fact,
19 conforming to the MUTCD. And that the yellow change
20 intervals in particular and the other timing aspects are set
21 according to the manual. Because of the history, at least
22 in San Mateo County, where there is one city where there
23 were a number of citations that had been thrown out because
24 they had, in fact, set the timing too short.

25 So we went through the process of saying, let's

1 verify and certify every year that, in fact, we are
2 complying with the manual in terms of the application of
3 yellow change interval timing for those intersections that
4 are within the -- that are being enforced with red light
5 cameras. I've kind of expanded that. I just want to
6 certify that citywide because I don't want to be deviating
7 anywhere, especially with shorter times anywhere in the
8 city. But the annual certification is helpful.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Hamid.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just one thing
12 as we are going just to remind my colleagues' memory. If
13 you haven't had a chance to read that little paper I put
14 together, that that subcommittee that we got into this
15 discussion seven, eight years ago, one of the very first
16 things that everybody in the subcommittee agreed is that an
17 intersection that has a red light camera is absolutely no
18 different than any other signalized intersection. Just
19 somebody has added a red light camera to that intersection.

20 The functioning of the traffic signal, the humanistic part
21 of it, the human behavior, the driver reaction time, all
22 that stuff is exactly identical.

23 For that reason from a traffic engineering
24 perspective everybody in the subcommittee -- this was the
25 very first item we agreed on. That just because a city has

1 decided to put a red light camera at an intersection, it
2 doesn't change the yellow timing requirement for that
3 intersection. You can take that camera out tomorrow and
4 that intersection is going to be exactly as it was
5 yesterday. If the camera is off that day for technical
6 reasons, still the behavior of the human beings and drivers
7 approaching that intersection are going to remain the same.

8 So we all very soon agreed that although a red camera might
9 be the nexus behind the discussion, but the fact of the
10 yellow timing calculation should be based on science,
11 research, as in NCHRP 731, and so on and so forth.

12 And again for the reasons that I explained, I
13 don't want to rehash it. If you ended up with a posted
14 speed limit. And who knows, you may end up there again even
15 if you decide to further discuss it. But one of the things
16 that I would like, you know, for us to think about is that
17 if in our minds if --

18 Some jurisdictions, for example City of Anaheim,
19 they just had an ordinance a few years ago, it's a charter
20 city, it's not a general law city, they just had the
21 ordinance that in perpetuity banned the installation of any
22 red light camera anywhere in the city of Anaheim. It
23 doesn't mean that City of Anaheim doesn't have dangerous,
24 so-called dangerous intersections, of course they do, but
25 they just decided not to use cameras. The people of that

1 city don't want cameras.

2 So next door, say, the city of -- I don't know who
3 uses. Costa Mesa. Costa Mesa is using red light cameras.
4 It doesn't mean that then yellow timing requirements two
5 blocks away in Costa Mesa are different just because they
6 put a red light camera there. That you have to look at the
7 different methodology, that you have now to look at a
8 different formula. That is the reason that we back in '04,
9 '05, whenever we had those discussions, very soon said,
10 let's not distinguish between the camera intersections and
11 non-camera. That's just what I wanted to kind of remind
12 everyone of that discussion. Nobody was on the Committee
13 then so I just wanted to share that.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: If there are no
15 further comments from the Committee I think it will be a
16 good time to open the discussion up to the public. So if
17 you have an opinion and would like to be heard this is your
18 opportunity. Yes, sir.

19 MR. BEEBER: I'm here -- I was invited to speak.
20 Is this the time that you're inviting me to speak to give my
21 PowerPoint or --

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: It's your choice.
23 You can do it now, you can wait, but it's open to you.

24 MR. BEEBER: Whenever the committee feels --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Then let' see it.

1 MR. BEEBER: Okay, thank you.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

3 MR. BEEBER: Thank you very much. My name is Jay
4 Beeber, I am the Executive Director of Safer Streets LA. I
5 want to thank the Committee for inviting me here to speak
6 today and give this presentation.

7 There's a number of things that have been
8 discussed here so far and interestingly enough I am going to
9 cover a lot of what you have commented on. I am just going
10 to kind of get into this. I will be trying to get through
11 this as quickly as possible so if anybody wants me to slow
12 down and stop on something please just let me know, that way
13 we can back to something if you want.

14 This question is really about the question of
15 reducing red light running violations and collisions through
16 a longer amber signal phase. Just to give you a little bit
17 about my background, I am the Executive Director of Safer
18 Streets LA, I am a research with the Reason Foundation, I am
19 a member of the ITE -- thank you to Zaki Mustafa who
20 recommended that I apply. There were -- I have done
21 numerous studies on traffic safety and what happens when you
22 change yellow timing and that sort of thing. I am a member
23 of the Los Angeles Pedestrian Advisory Committee and I
24 graduated with Honors from the University of Michigan. I
25 have received a number of awards, I won't go into those.

1 So the question is, do longer yellow signal times
2 reduce red light running? The answer is an unqualified yes.

3 And I appreciate the Chair's comments on the -- on the
4 studies that he saw on this. But I will take exception to
5 one of the things that he said which was that there were no
6 studies that used -- that started with the ITE minimum.

7 And there are a number of studies that actually
8 have. In fact, one of the major studies, which is the Texas
9 DOT-TTI, Texas Transportation Institute studies, they did a
10 number of measurements and their baseline was the -- was the
11 calculated minimum, the IT calculated minimum. And I have
12 spoken to the author of that and have provided you with a
13 number of his comments. I asked him that specific question
14 because that has come up and he said yes, the baseline was
15 the ITE minimums were what was calculated to be appropriate
16 according to that formula and we found that there was an
17 additional benefit going beyond that. But I'll show you
18 actually some examples of that.

19 There's a couple of other studies, Van der Horst
20 and Wilmlink in 1986 found a 50 percent decrease in red light
21 running and Retting also found a 36 percent decrease in red
22 light running where the yellow interval was increased by one
23 second.

24 Okay, so this is from the Texas Transportation
25 Institute study. You can see that it says the factor is a

1 yellow interval duration and you can see that in the first
2 set of columns that if you -- if the yellow time was about a
3 second under what the ITE said, there was about a 110
4 percent increase in red light running. When the one second
5 -- when it was one second above it was about 53 percent
6 reduction. And again, Dr. Karl Zimmerman has confirmed that
7 that is exactly what that means, it's above what the
8 calculated amount was from the ITE formula.

9 This is another example of a chart of -- and I am
10 going to figure out where the pointer is. Here we go, okay.

11 So if you can see the zero/zero here, is the ITE minimum.
12 Okay? It says "observed minus computed." The computed is
13 the ITE, computed using their formula. And as you can see
14 that's the zero/zero in this chart. You can see there is
15 still a reduction when you go above that.

16 The same thing with this chart. Again the zero/
17 zero is over here and you can see the trend line keeps going
18 down.

19 This is crashes. So there has been a question,
20 well, you can reduce red light running but do you reduce
21 crashes? Of course the answer is "yes" according to this
22 study as well. You can see it is not quite as dramatic but
23 there is still a reduction below once you go above the ITE
24 minimum. And again Dr. Zimmerman has confirmed these
25 results. I won't get into the exact question and answer but

1 basically each of these questions was as to whether it was
2 the ITE formula that was used to calculate. He said yes and
3 he said he confirmed that. All of this was in a PDF that we
4 sent to you, if you haven't received that we'll make sure
5 that you get it. But you can read his responses and also a
6 longer response between he and I in terms of this.

7 And again, these were -- I'm going to go through
8 it real quick and just -- these are -- each of those figures
9 that I just showed you, some of the figure numbers are a
10 little bit different because they had different reports and
11 they just numbered the figures differently but they are
12 basically the same figures.

13 FHWA has certain recommended practices and to
14 improve signal timing is one of them that traffic engineers
15 make sure the yellow change is set properly. The question
16 is, what exactly is that? But again, here his research
17 shows the yellow interval duration is a significant factor.

18 When the intervals are set too short it's likely to be a
19 higher incident of red light running. And when they're
20 higher, obviously that's -- if the approach speed is not
21 known the speed limit plus 10 miles per hour is recommended.

22 That is FHWA-recommended practice. So it's important to
23 note that there is that.

24 There's also other factors that we haven't talked
25 about yet, which is a question of higher vehicle -- sorry --

1 larger vehicle traffic and things of that nature or a
2 population of older drivers or people with longer reaction
3 times, I'll get into that in a few moments. And I'm just
4 going to keep going from here, okay.

5 So studies from red light camera locations, and we
6 have done a number of them, have shown a significant
7 reduction of red light running when the yellow times have
8 been increased. Okay.

9 This is an intersection at Mission Boulevard at
10 Mohave Drive in Fremont, California. Now the minimum yellow
11 time is 4.3 seconds. That is computed based on a 45 mile
12 posted speed limit. That the is exact number that you get
13 when you use the ITE formula. And you can see that there
14 were a large number -- as you can see in here, this is how
15 many violations were occurring on a monthly basis before at
16 the -- at the ITE minimum.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: How many of those
18 violations resulted in a collision?

19 MR. BEEBER: I don't know, probably not very many.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.

21 MR. BEEBER: There were all fraction of a second.

22 These are almost all fraction of a second violations.

23 These are all up to about a second.

24 When Caltrans was asked to come out to take a look
25 at this intersection they came out there, their engineer

1 came out and he said, we should change the yellow light time
2 and increase it by seven-tenths of a second. So again,
3 that's above the ITE minimum. And you can see what occurred
4 is that immediately, this is a half a month right here of
5 the change, you can see immediately that the red light
6 running was reduced significantly and has held over two
7 years. So there was no rebound, there was no change back.
8 It has been consistent and it stayed. That reduction is an
9 80 percent reduction on average, Took the average of these
10 and the average of these and you get an 80 percent
11 reduction.

12 At this intersection at Citrus Avenue in Redlands
13 they had a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour, their
14 yellow light time was set at the MUTCD minimum in California
15 of 3 seconds. You can see they increased it to 3.9 so
16 almost a full second and you can see, again, the reduction
17 in red light running. They had a lot of red light running
18 to start with and then afterwards it was reduced. And
19 again, it stayed down over these months; they eventually
20 pulled out the red light camera so there was no more data.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Could I ask a
22 question on that?

23 MR. BEEBER: Sure, absolutely.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: So you mentioned the
25 posted speed was the 85th percentile speed checked?

1 MR. BEEBER: I don't know, I just know that they
2 increased the yellow light time.

3 MR. PYBURN: So it could have been a higher speed.

4 MR. BEEBER: It could have been. That probably
5 was a factor in terms of why just using the posted speed is
6 not sufficient. This is a perfect example, because the 85th
7 may have been higher, there may have been other factors why
8 people were running the red light as well.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Can I ask a
10 question, Mr. Chairman?

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Please.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: On the Mission
13 Boulevard you said that the increase was only from 4.3 --
14 was only .7 seconds?

15 MR. BEEBER: Right, seven-tenths.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Seven-tenths.

17 MR. BEEBER: Right.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's a second
19 -- by seven-tenths of a second over a period of two years
20 you cut the red light running practically in half.

21 MR. BEEBER: Eighty percent.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Eighty percent.

23 MR. BEEBER: More than half.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Eighty percent.

25 MR. BEEBER: And if they went up to one second

1 they would have gotten more than 80 percent.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And we know --
3 instantly we know that the higher number of red light
4 running the higher changes of a red light accident.

5 MR. BEEBER: Exactly.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: In this case
7 what was the change? How much did --

8 MR. BEEBER: That was almost a full second, I
9 think they went from 3 to 3.9. Again, I have no idea why
10 they picked these numbers, that's kind of lost to history.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We went from 3
12 seconds to 3.9 seconds and we cut the accidents by almost
13 two-thirds.

14 MR. BEEBER: Right.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I mean -- not
16 the accidents, the red light running.

17 MR. BEEBER: I can't read it from here, it's 88
18 percent, I believe.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The red light
20 running was cut by 88 percent.

21 MR. BEEBER: And the reason is because the red
22 light running, as you extend it out you get -- the first
23 increment you get the largest decrease in red light running
24 because the -- I'll show you a chart of this, exactly what
25 it looks like in terms of late into the red. But it's like

1 a hockey stick and it's very, very high in the first few
2 fractions of a second and then kind of goes down gradually.

3 You get to about one second you are almost at nothing and
4 then it kind of trails off after that.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And back in
6 2004/2005 we did not have these statistics, we did not
7 have --

8 MR. BEEBER: That's correct.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: -- the
10 technology to measure how significant a .5 or .7 second
11 changes the number of red light running.

12 MR. BEEBER: Right. And one of the benefits, if I
13 may, I hope I don't make anybody's head explode, about two
14 red light cameras is that they will tell you where you have
15 a problem in terms of your yellow light timing. They will
16 tell -- if you look at the statistics and say, there's a
17 whole lot of people still running the red, I've got 200, 300
18 a month, your yellow light timing is off. I mean -- so, I
19 mean, they can tell you exactly where you have a problem.

20 This is one of the reasons -- and I'll let,
21 obviously, the Assembly Member speak for himself, but one of
22 the reasons why I believe he focused on these, which is
23 these are the locations where you can look at the data and
24 you can see there is a problem. You want to measure them at
25 other locations with some technology I'm sure you'll find

1 some other intersections as well that have the same -- have
2 the same problem. Okay.

3 Again, this was in Loma Linda. As you can see,
4 Loma Linda actually changed their time twice. They had
5 under-time by .3 of a second over here, they were 45 mile an
6 hour. They were .3 of a second over here. And you can see
7 they had a large number of red light runners to start with,
8 okay. They increased by only .3 of a second and because
9 they realized that they were under time based on the law.
10 And so what you get is over here. Again, this is -- 142 is
11 a half a month and so you get a new average down here. This
12 is when it was at the ITE minimum.

13 They increased on the mayor's authority, pretty
14 much for no other reason than the TTI study from Texas. He
15 said, I think we can do better than that, I think we can
16 reduce red light running even more. And he asked for an
17 additional increase in the yellow light time, arbitrarily or
18 however you want to call it, by one second. And you can see
19 the red light running was eliminated almost completely here.

20 And you can see there is incremental decreases. I believe
21 the first change was at around 60 percent and I believe the
22 second change for the additional second was around a 93
23 percent difference.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman,
25 may I just ask one question?

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I have a question
2 first and then Hamid.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure. No, no,
4 of course.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: We're discussing the
6 changes in the yellow and the change in -- affecting red
7 light running. Do you have data that identify the effect on
8 accidents as well?

9 MR. BEEBER: I do.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I would suggest that
11 we -- we are keenly interested in safety in these locations,
12 you know, I mean, obviously I have my opinion. But, you
13 know, they're identifying where the yellow time is too short
14 for the city. And then instead of the city changing the
15 yellow time they put in a red light camera and ticket a
16 whole bunch of people.

17 I am just going to scoot through these. These are
18 just locations in Virginia. Again, red light cameras
19 existed, after they changed the yellow time it went down.
20 I'm just going to go through them real quick. Here is
21 another one, a fairly dramatic difference from where the
22 yellow light time was original and then it was increased, I
23 believe, by -- I think that was a half a second, I am not
24 100 percent sure on that one, but you can just read the
25 chart. It's in your -- it's in your materials and it went

1 down significantly.

2 Okay. So your question about where we have
3 collision statistics. This is the part of that that I want
4 to talk about. But first I want to show you. This is a
5 typical timing to red of red light violations. Again, this
6 is from the camera company data. And it shows that at this
7 particular intersection in Oakland in November of 2009, and
8 I'll explain why I picked that month to start with, there
9 was -- this is what the pattern is. So as you can see, the
10 red light running kind of trails off after you get over
11 about a second.

12 And what we found with the studies, and I have it
13 included in this presentation, but if you look at the time
14 into red, what percentage of your violations are occurring
15 within that time period, say it's .5 of a second or .7 of a
16 second, and you increase your yellow time by that amount,
17 that's the amount that your yellow -- that your violations
18 will decrease. It happens every single time.

19 But let me show you what happened. So in Oakland,
20 on their own authority the Department of Transportation in
21 Oakland had gotten a lot of complaints about the cameras and
22 they said, let's increase the yellow light time by one
23 second. And so at this particular intersection -- and
24 again, these are straight-through, only straight-through
25 violations. There's a whole different pattern if you're

1 doing rolling right turns and things of that nature. But
2 this is the result the month after they made the one second
3 change, fairly dramatic. One second was added.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: One moment, Mark,
5 Janice had a question.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: And maybe not this
7 particular one but the previous intersections you were
8 looking at. I know the camera there is helping us collect
9 the data to find what is going on. So before they changed
10 the yellow time intervals, say from 4 to 4.3 or 3 to 3.9,
11 was there -- were the cameras on prior to that? So is there
12 the data before -- more data before that? Meaning, was it
13 because the cameras are up there so everybody is going to
14 not run, or was it truly because the yellow interval was
15 changed and that's why they are not running?

16 MR. BEEBER: Let me just go back real quick, okay.
17 So in this particular, which is Mission Boulevard, okay,
18 the cameras are on here. The cameras were on for a long
19 time. There's only a limited amount of time that we could
20 ask so we didn't want to burden them with a lot more data.
21 But if you go back in history and you just look at the
22 charts and whatnot, it just continues all the way back.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Okay, so the cameras
24 were on.

25 MR. BEEBER: The cameras were on. This is all

1 camera data. The only way we have this data, for us. We
2 don't have resources to go out and do --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Right.

4 MR. BEEBER: -- our own studies. The cameras are
5 telling us this.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Mark, you had a
7 question.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: This location in
9 Oakland where adding a second dramatically decreased the red
10 light running, did the yellow timing conform to the ITE
11 guideline before it was changed?

12 MR. BEEBER: Yes. In fact, it was actually a
13 little bit above. They actually when they started their
14 program, I believe they went a little bit above. I actually
15 have a chart of that, not in the materials that I have but I
16 can provide it to you if you'd like to see. They have every
17 intersection, the dates they made the change, what change.
18 And some of them they also increased some all-red phases as
19 well. But they were definitely at at least the minimum, I
20 believe slightly above.

21 What happened in Oakland, and there is a great
22 deal of documentation on this so I am not making this up,
23 okay. What happened was when they made this change the
24 police department in Oakland started sending some memos to
25 the engineers in the city and said, what are you doing?

1 This is a problem. We need to fix this problem. Your
2 change has now impeded our ability to have -- this is a
3 negative impact on our red light camera program. So less
4 red light running was a negative impact on their red light
5 camera program that was intended to reduce red light
6 running. This is the reason why this is such a major issue.

7 Because unfortunately, and we are not saying it for
8 everybody, sometimes there is a perverse incentive not to do
9 the engineering change because they are afraid that revenue
10 will go down or whatever. And again, I am just going by
11 what the memo said.

12 I'll show you -- this is the important part.
13 Okay. These are collisions, okay. This data is taken by
14 the CHP SWITRS database, okay. So we went back -- the
15 cameras were put in about here but we went back and looked
16 at all the collisions. These are at all of their red light
17 camera locations. So we looked back in history of what
18 happened at those locations before they put the cameras in.

19 These are -- this is the history of -- you can see that
20 they were running about, on an average, about two collisions
21 over there. I think there's about 9 or 11 or so
22 intersections. So about two on average per month, okay.

23 This is the period of time when they had the
24 longer yellow light time at the red light camera
25 intersections. When they made the change and they decreased

1 it again under pressure from the police department you can
2 see what happened with the collisions. So your question as
3 far as, you know, this is just one place and, you know,
4 could it -- could it be an anomaly? You know, who knows.
5 I'd like to do more studies. But mostly what happens is
6 they make the change and then they hopefully keep it and not
7 roll it back. So, you know, we don't see the collisions go
8 back up again. But you can see at least in this instance
9 there is this gap of collisions when they increase the
10 yellow light time by one second. And then unfortunately
11 they didn't keep that change and public safety was
12 compromised.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: How long was
14 that duration?

15 MR. BEEBER: That's about a four month period.
16 Four, four and a half months.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And nothing
18 else changed at that --

19 MR. BEEBER: Nothing else changed. They just
20 changed -- they rolled the yellow light time back by one
21 second.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: How did --

23 MR. BEEBER: And again --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: How did the Oakland
25 Police Department justify that?

1 MR. BEEBER: They said that their yellow light
2 time was too high, it was not conforming to the ITE
3 standards. They kept -- Again, this is the same discussion
4 that we're having here which is, we have to have the same
5 standard everywhere. You have to have the same standard
6 everywhere. So they forced them to have the same standard
7 everywhere. Collisions went back up again.

8 I will speak to that. I hope I have a few moments
9 to speak to whether we do it everywhere or not. Because
10 right now -- actually I'm going to speak to it now.

11 There is a patchwork of standards that is being
12 used in the state. Even though the manual has a minimum,
13 okay. And some locations that want to abuse the practice of
14 red light cameras will set their yellow light times at a
15 minimum and will refuse, even under an avalanche of evidence
16 that they could reduce their red light running by increasing
17 their yellow light times, they refuse to do it.

18 And the city of Fremont is a perfect example of
19 it. There is nobody here from Fremont that I'm going to
20 insult by saying that. But they know that where Caltrans
21 has increased their yellow light times at the Caltrans-
22 controlled intersections in terms of the timing, their red
23 light running -- they have the data, it goes down
24 immediately. They refuse to do it at their own
25 intersections. "We don't need to." That's their answer.

1 We've gone time and time again and said, look at
2 the data. Caltrans increased at that one intersection in
3 December of -- this past December; they increased it at a
4 second location that they, that they control. And they're
5 doing exactly the right thing. They're going out there,
6 they're saying the yellow light times are not, are not long
7 enough, and they are doing the right thing. The city
8 refuses to make the change at other intersections.

9 Okay. So the evidence is overwhelming that yellow
10 light time, the longer yellow light time above the ITE
11 minimum or, you know, above maybe something slightly below
12 the IT minimum, is a benefit in terms of safety, in terms of
13 the amount of collisions -- I'm sorry, the amount of red
14 light running that we see. I am not going to read every
15 single one of these but you can see, this is just sort of a
16 list of those.

17 Now I want to talk about Georgia for a second.
18 Georgia did exactly what AB 612 proposed to do, which is
19 they had a bill and they said, let's increase by one second
20 at only at our yellow -- at our red light camera
21 intersections. We have a report from Congress and also a
22 letter from the Honorable Senator Barry Loudermilk from
23 Georgia and he tells us that what happened was that
24 violations dropped 72 percent at red light camera
25 intersections and some local governments reported that the

1 violations dropped as much as 81 percent. And again,
2 there's some documentation that he has provided in addition
3 to this that there was no adverse effects elsewhere because
4 they only did it at the red light camera locations.

5 Other cities -- we actually went off on this for a
6 second. There is, again, a hodgepodge of what's going on in
7 the state of California. The city of Pasadena, and I just
8 spoke to them this week to confirm this, I didn't have time
9 to get documentation for you but we can certainly get it.
10 The city of Pasadena uses 10 miles above their posted speed
11 limit because they recognize that their posted speed limits
12 are lower than what their 85ths are and they just do it on
13 their own. They had a red light camera program, they have
14 eliminated it. They have increased their yellow light time,
15 they've probably increased their all-reds to some extent.
16 And they have increased safety by doing that and they are
17 rolling this out slowly.

18 And one of the things that came up in that
19 conversation with their city engineer was that they are
20 making these changes because -- and I am not familiar with
21 this and I'm sure this Committee knows much more about this
22 than I do, that there has been some mandates from the
23 changes in the manual for pedestrian timing and for bicycle
24 timing. And they said, as we are making those changes we
25 are just -- you know, it's not costing us extra, we are just

1 going out and, you know. It cost us a little extra to do
2 the additional calculations but we're going out there and we
3 are -- we're making the yellow light timing changes, on
4 their own, citywide.

5 The city of -- the city of West Hollywood is
6 increasing by five miles an hour over the posted speed
7 limit.

8 The city and county of Sacramento use two
9 different standards. Sacramento uses the 90th percentile,
10 the county, the city uses, I believe, the 85th percentile.

11 So again, there is just a patchwork. And again,
12 Caltrans obviously has made these changes at intersections
13 that they control in the same city and the same corridor
14 where the yellow light time conforms to the ITE minimum.
15 They have gone beyond that. Apparently they feel that there
16 isn't a problem, to some extent. I cannot speak for anybody
17 but clearly based on that they have a slightly different
18 standard that they are using.

19 And again here is another table from another
20 study. Whoops, that was backwards. Okay. And again, this
21 is another study that showed -- this is one, they used a
22 slightly different formula, not the ITE formula but I mean
23 the -- they used to get the zero point, they have it as one
24 here. And you can see there has been a reduction. I think
25 this is crashes but I can't read it from here. I forget

1 which one this is. Crashes, yeah, crash rates, the crash
2 rates. You can see the crash rates went down when they went
3 above the ITE minimum.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Can you wrap up in
5 about five minutes?

6 MR. BEEBER: I'll try, okay. I know this is
7 running long, okay.

8 So again there is a question, do drivers adjust to
9 the longer yellow time. The evidence shows that there isn't
10 adjustment. You can see from the charts that I showed you
11 that there isn't an adaptation over long periods of time.
12 But also the experts tell us this, I am not going to go
13 through all of these.

14 I did want to talk about the ITE Kinematic Formula
15 for a moment, okay. This is the original formula here,
16 okay. This is California has simplified it so they've
17 dropped the component for the grade approach, so there is no
18 requirement for cities or localities to adjust for the
19 approach grade. And also we are using the posted speed
20 limit s opposed to -- as opposed to the actual approach
21 speed. Okay.

22 So the original formula came from a study or a
23 paper that was done in 1959 called the Problem of the Amber
24 Light -- the Amber Signal Light in Traffic flow. And they
25 were trying to figure out what number will allow you to

1 eliminate a Type 1 Dilemma Zone. It was not a question of
2 what is the proper yellow time overall. It was, how do we
3 eliminate the dilemma zone if you know what the approach
4 speed is of a vehicle, if you know what the perception and
5 reaction time is, if you know what their deceleration rate
6 is. If you know those three factors you can eliminate a
7 Type 1 Dilemma Zone. And that is the only thing that this
8 paper did. This was eventually adopted as the way to set
9 yellow light times. And as you can -- hopefully we'll have
10 some time. I can show you why that sometimes does not
11 follow that it's the appropriate thing to do. Okay.

12 So if -- this is what they were trying to
13 eliminate. If you -- the way that they calculate it was
14 they said, how long does it take a car to stop, okay,
15 assuming that you -- so the critical stopping distance. And
16 they said, you've got to have your yellow light time at
17 least long enough for the vehicle to cross that distance.
18 If you don't there's going to be a section where, in the
19 roadway, the dilemma zone, where you are going to have a
20 place where the driver can't do the right thing. They can't
21 either stop in time or they can't cross the limit line in
22 time. And that's the purpose of this.

23 So when you do it properly and you know the right
24 numbers you get -- you eliminate the dilemma zone. Okay.
25 But you have to get the variables correct, okay. You have

1 to get the right approach speed, you have to get the
2 approach -- the correct driver perception reaction time, you
3 have to get the correct deceleration rate, you have to
4 adjust for the grade. Okay.

5 So it's made up of two components. There's the
6 stopping distance. I'm going to go through this real quick
7 because you guys all know this stuff. You've got the
8 braking distance, okay, and then you have the distance
9 during which the car travels during the perception reaction
10 time. You put those two things together and this is the
11 formula that tells you what your critical stopping distance
12 is, okay. So that gives you this section of the roadway,
13 that's just the critical stopping, okay. Then you calculate
14 what the minimum yellow time is and that's, again, just
15 distance over your velocity.

16 Now here is the question. What is the velocity?
17 The ITE formula assumes that the velocity is the approach
18 speed. It may not be because drivers can slow down, they
19 can change their speed while they're crossing that distance.

20 If you assume that no driver ever slows down then you have
21 a yellow light time that eliminates your Type 1 Dilemma
22 Zone. But I have turning lanes and other -- many other
23 instances, drivers slow down. It takes them longer to cross
24 to the -- to the limit line, okay. So let's just back that
25 again, okay.

1 So, again, we talked about this. California
2 protocols do not address the following questions: What is
3 the actual approach speed? What is the perception reaction
4 time? Is there a downgrade? And what about larger
5 vehicles?

6 So we are allowing jurisdictions to legally set
7 their yellow signal time at a duration that ensures that
8 some drivers will unintentionally violate the red, which is
9 why when you extend it out you get less red light running.

10 In the Report 731 there is a question of
11 perception reaction time. They found that the one second
12 that we are currently using is only about 50 percent of
13 drivers. If you want to get to the first standard deviation
14 or about the 85th percent of reaction times -- they measured
15 this at locations where drivers were reacting to the amber
16 light. They found that it's somewhere in here, okay. So
17 it's somewhere around a little bit above 1.3, 1.4 seconds.
18 So perception reaction time is also an important part that
19 this study found. Okay.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Can you wrap up?

21 MR. BEEBER: Okay. So the approach speed, real
22 quick, they found and we talked about this, they found that
23 the approach speed at locations, including ones in
24 California, were routinely 5 to 10 miles an hour above the
25 posted speed limit, the average is 7.5 miles in their study.

1 They rounded down to 7 miles an hour as a recommendation
2 over the posted. We said, you want to get about 6 seconds,
3 you go to 8 miles per hour. If you add that to the
4 additional 4 seconds for a longer reaction time that gives
5 us one second longer for the yellow time. And that is sort
6 of how the bill, the genesis of the bill. It was not
7 arbitrary. It's that we took these two factors that the
8 studies show us, longer reaction time slightly, higher
9 approach speed, and you get about a second longer than what
10 we're doing currently.

11 I just want to give a real world example. Let me
12 see if I can do this. I'm not going to do it right now. If
13 anybody wants to hear it I'll just --

14 There is one other thing. Okay. I just want to
15 talk for a moment about vehicles that slow down on their
16 approach. The problem with the ITE standards -- I'm sorry,
17 the manual standards right now in California is you have a
18 blanket three seconds for a left turn lane, okay. Every
19 expert that I have spoken to has said that that is not the
20 proper way to do that, that you have to know what the
21 approach speed is, you can adjust slightly because you think
22 that -- and the Report 731 says this. You can adjust
23 slightly downward from the posted speed limit but you have
24 to use some version of what the real approach speed is.

25 But here is the other thing. What we talked about

1 is that when drivers slow down it takes them longer to cross
2 at that limit line. So I want to give a real world example
3 here. I assumed that a vehicle was traveling at 40 miles an
4 hour, that's 5 miles an hour above the posted speed limit,
5 so that means he has a critical stopping distance of 231
6 feet. I am going to assume the vehicle is 190 feet from the
7 intersection when the light turns yellow, that's in the
8 double left turn pocket, okay. So he's too close to stop
9 because he's within the 231 feet, okay, so he must also slow
10 down, okay. If you do the calculation you've got slowing
11 down from 40 miles an hour to about 20 miles per hour, that
12 means he's traveling an average of 30 miles an hour or 44
13 feet per second. He has to cover that 190 feet to cross the
14 limit line; how long will it take? It takes him 4.32
15 seconds. The yellow light time is allowed to be 3 second in
16 that instance. So we have a problem because there are
17 people who don't do anything wrong and they are running the
18 red light. It's a safety issue, it's also an enforcement
19 issue and --

20 I'll move on and just go to the recommendations.
21 Okay. So just the proposals. This is one of the things
22 that we're recommending you do at photo-enforced
23 intersections, you can couple some of this with a -- with a
24 grace period, however you want to figure this out. You need
25 about an additional second for drivers in order -- in order

1 to make it safer and also to ensure that enforcement is not
2 used improperly.

3 So what you can is you can mandate the posted
4 speed limit plus 8 miles an hour for the approach speed, you
5 can use 1.4 seconds as the perception reaction time, that
6 will add about a second to the current yellow time. For
7 turning movements you use this little chart. This is,
8 again, based on the Report 731. And you use the approach
9 speed to calculate the critical distance. You use the
10 average speed to calculate the yellow time. Or you can use
11 the same time as the through movement for your left turns.

12 Okay. Thank you. Thank you for indulging me.
13 That was really long and I really appreciate the time that
14 you spent.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you for the
16 information.

17 MR. BEEBER: I'm happy to answer any questions if
18 there are any.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Do we have a
20 question?

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just an
22 observation, colleagues. Maybe we should have started with
23 this. When I talked with Caltrans people and Mr. Nazarian's
24 office -- and I have never met Mr. Beeber. He shared his
25 research with me, his paper. And we had a very long

1 telephone conversation going over numbers and formula and
2 all that but this is the first time we meet.

3 When we looked at these it was the -- it was not
4 the question of red light cameras and it was not only the
5 question of tickets and people paying millions of dollars
6 worth there, not really doing anything unsafe. What was
7 more concerning to us was that looking at the evidence and
8 looking at the numbers, totally unbiased and objective,
9 maybe we can do better in California. Maybe we can -- all
10 that I am asking is for the Committee to acknowledge that
11 there is enough evidence that warrants a further look at
12 this issue.

13 Maybe if these numbers are holding we only have
14 the tools at these intersections to collect the data.
15 That's the pattern all over California, all 36,000
16 intersections. We have just had the tools at 400 and we
17 collected them at half a dozen. But that shows what is
18 happening out there. And maybe we owe it to our people to
19 look at these and do something that in the long run reduces
20 the red light running issue. That's why I sponsored it.
21 The issue is not to focus only on red light camera. But
22 this is serious research, these are serious numbers and
23 facts.

24 But sometimes, you know, when we do something for
25 30, 40 years in a certain way we become resistant to any

1 change. And I hope that we at least acknowledge we need to
2 look at it a little bit more in depth.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: With the technology
4 that we have and the measurements that we can get using the
5 red light camera technology. Obviously that is more
6 information than they had, you know, 20 years ago when this
7 kind of stuff was coming up. So I agree with you, Hamid,
8 that there is enough information here that it bears looking
9 farther into.

10 We are about safety here. We are not about making
11 money using red light cameras. And that's what we need to
12 maintain our focus on, to improve safety in locations, not
13 to increase a budget in any of these agencies. So as long
14 as we are doing that, if we can use this information to
15 enhance safety then I am all for it.

16 One of the studies that Mr. Beeber mentioned was
17 done by Mr. Richard Rettig, he is with the Insurance
18 Institute for Highway Safety. And he did a paper in '07
19 called Reducing Red Light Running Through Longer Yellow
20 Signal Timing and Red Light Camera Enforcement, Results of a
21 Field Investigation, I'm sure you've read it.

22 MR. BEEBER: I have read it. There's some flaws
23 in that study.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Well, I found it
25 quite interesting and easy to agree with as well, just like

1 yours. Some of these -- some of the conclusions that he
2 drew were that yes, you can increase the yellow time and
3 reduce red light running. But he posits that you should do
4 that but don't consider getting rid of your cameras because
5 they are -- they continue to be a good tool. When he looked
6 at raising the yellow time and then elimination of the
7 camera versus raising the yellow time and maintaining the
8 camera he found a continued improvement by keeping the
9 cameras in place.

10 So I found that interesting. We certainly need to
11 be looking at changes to yellow time but I -- if there are
12 flaws to that assumption I am not sure what they are. At
13 some point in time I'd like to talk to you about that.

14 MR. BEEBER: We have always said -- just to answer
15 that. We have always said that if you do the engineering
16 first you may not need the cameras. But if you still have a
17 problem and you want to put them in --

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: You could be -- that
19 could well be right.

20 MR. BEEBER: Yeah.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: That could well be
22 right.

23 MR. BEEBER: So I am not disagreeing with the
24 theory of it.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: John, you had a

1 question or a comment?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: A question and a
3 comment, Mr. Chair.

4 The question is, ultimately when we bring this
5 back what is the action being requested of the Committee?
6 That is the question.

7 And then the comment is that personally I am
8 supportive of automated enforcement technology as long as it
9 is not misused.

10 And I further think that the revolution in image
11 processing that is underway right now, that is in the
12 process of revolutionizing pedestrian and bicycle detection,
13 the ability to do automated counts and movement logging of
14 users that used to be done by humans, is going to in the
15 next decade and a half revolutionize the design of
16 intersections. So I think that far from being the minuscule
17 exception in terms of numbers, that automated components of
18 intersection enforcement are today, I think the trend is
19 that most intersections 20 years from now will have a lot of
20 image smarts and be able to assist safety and enforcement
21 personnel legally and reasonably.

22 I think that it is an artificial distinction today
23 that they are only in a few sites.

24 That said, I went through Jay's copious
25 documentation. I am compelled that this needs a look by

1 people much more sophisticated in their understanding of
2 signals than I am, or want to be. But I wonder whether to
3 -- the notion of the bill itself, AB 612, I'm a little
4 uncomfortable, more than a little uncomfortable with
5 mandating a blanket one second increase even for this
6 restricted class of signal that is automatically enforced
7 because it should be an MUTCD change in response to these
8 concerns. Adding one second to whatever, where "whatever"
9 is a moving target, that seems like a problem going forward.

10 So I am in support of our advising Caltrans to,
11 yes, look into this. This does seem like mathematically
12 it's an important thing to get right for a safety
13 perspective and I'll let it stand right there.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay, we need to get
15 back out. I know there's a lot of thoughts still out there
16 and we'll get back to that. Larry, you had one question and
17 then we'll go back to the public.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I'll wait until the
19 rest of the public comment.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay.

21 MR. BEEBER: I just want to thank the Committee
22 again for indulging.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

24 MR. BEEBER: And just one final thing is, if
25 you're going to set a yellow light time and your loved one

1 is at the cross traffic, which are you going to use? Are
2 you going to use the absolute minimum or are you going to
3 give an additional extra yellow time to make sure that
4 nothing happens?

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you very much.
6 Sir.

7 MR. DORNSIFE: My name is Chad Dornsife, I am the
8 Executive Director of the Best Highway Safety Practices
9 Institute, I also represent the National Motorists
10 Association in this region on these issues.

11 More importantly, I was part of the San Diego red
12 light lawyer challenge to the San Diego red light cameras
13 that took place in the early 2000s and we looked at the data
14 extensively. What was the most interesting thing we found
15 is the camera people when they went in the field had a cheat
16 sheet. And we got copies of that in the discovery saying,
17 this particular intersection had a restriction. In other
18 words, the headway didn't clear all the people trying to
19 turn left so this would be a good location. Or this one had
20 a short yellow. So the cheat sheet for the camera companies
21 was exactly -- embodies the entire problem here.

22 More importantly, the one intersection that was
23 the poster child was down by the airport. It was writing
24 over 3,000, 2,800, 3,200 tickets a month. The City of San
25 Diego was making \$1 million a month off of that one

1 intersection. What was interesting there was, prior to the
2 camera going in there hadn't been a single accident. During
3 the entire two or three years that we looked at it there
4 hadn't been an accident. It was the fact that the traffic
5 had to wait two or three phases to clear that intersection.

6 They went from a 3 second yellow to a 4.9 second
7 yellow and the violations went from 3,000 a month down to
8 several hundred. Then the city council in San Diego went
9 back and looked at this and said, well, maybe that isn't
10 right, we need to have a minimum 4 second yellow so they
11 shortened it from 4.9 back to 4 and then the citations
12 bumped up again.

13 But more importantly, the entire Kinematic Formula
14 when it was adopted in the early '80s and actually became a
15 standard at that time was a minimum. And in the ITE Manual
16 there was a -- and also in the '88 MUTCD. The manual had a
17 duty for the engineer to look at the intersection and make
18 sure that the signal timing met the needs, the safety needs
19 of the traffic. So the minimum was to be further adjusted
20 upon the conditions of that intersection. If there is a dip
21 that causes a vehicle to slow, if there is sight distance,
22 whatever it is need to be corrected.

23 Well that requirement to further mitigate for the
24 intersection's needs was removed. And it was removed
25 altogether in the 2002 MUTCD because in the '88 MUTCD it was

1 called 4B.20. And in that particular regulation it not only
2 required part of the maintenance of the signal that you had
3 to go back periodically to make sure that the signal timing
4 was adequate to meet the safety needs of the traffic, and
5 that was also removed.

6 I have done hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of
7 studies on different roadways around the state and my
8 favorite, one of my favorites was I was at a speed
9 management program Caltrans put on for all the cities down
10 in San Diego. And they were at the District Headquarters
11 there and a local municipality there, the guy was
12 complaining because he had to do the speed survey three
13 times over to get the right speed.

14 Reverse engineering is alive and well because of a
15 lot of pressures. And I have found literally in the
16 documentation, on their own studies, speeds approaching 20
17 miles an hour more greater for the prevailing speed than the
18 signal timings are set. Everybody thinks they are doing the
19 right thing because they've got the pressure. Somebody
20 wants this.

21 The point is is in one city, I'm not going to
22 mention what city it was, they put the cameras in and they
23 documented an improvement in the safety at the
24 intersections. What they didn't do was increase the yellow.
25 What they did is used the all-red to take the credit for

1 the safety improvement by removing the conflicts but they
2 maintained the revenue from the yellow light being too
3 short. So these type of anomalies and irregularities are
4 going on today.

5 I noticed -- I saw it up here on the presentation
6 a minute ago. Back when the Kinematic Formula was nothing
7 more than a rule of thumb. You know, almost like you need
8 one second for every ten miles of approach speed, but it was
9 put into a formula to do the signal timing. Well the rule
10 of thumb doesn't meet the standard of a micro -- a few
11 hundredths of a second for a violation of law that costs
12 somebody \$500. That's where engineers have to do a better
13 job to make sure the signal timing is right.

14 And I honestly believe that we need to put back
15 in, at least in California, the requirement to do periodic
16 reviews. If you've got an intersection issuing 3,000
17 tickets a month or 1,000 tickets a month you have got
18 constructive knowledge as an engineer that you've got a
19 problem. And it shouldn't sit there for two or three years
20 writing thousands of tickets. You need to go look at it and
21 find out what remedy needs to be done, what's causing the
22 motorists to be caught and fix it. Thank you.

23 MR. OLEA: Good morning, my name is Ricardo Olea,
24 I am the City Traffic Engineer with the City and County of
25 San Francisco.

1 I do think we have a problem as a profession if we
2 can have such wide divergence in terms of such a critical
3 value as the yellow. When I was seeing some of the values
4 being used for the yellow timing on some of these examples I
5 was going, that's not a -- that's not an appropriate yellow.
6 So I think we do need to have better standards. There are a
7 lot of issues that need to be looked at.

8 We do operate a red light camera system so we have
9 concerns with the legislation that adds a second to the --
10 the red light camera enforcement locations. Not necessarily
11 because it will impact the program but more because of the
12 inconsistencies it creates.

13 Going forward if the MUTCD or the California
14 standards change the legislation would add a second to those
15 revised standards, so we have been advocating for the state
16 and Caltrans to look at the matter to determine what is the
17 safe and appropriate yellow light, rather than just focus on
18 a very limited set of red light camera locations. If we are
19 in agreement that there is an issue I think it should be
20 addressed for all locations because it's a critical safety
21 issue.

22 In San Francisco we do use a longer yellow light.
23 We add 5 miles per hour to the posted speed limit more so
24 if we know the 85th percentile to be higher. We also round
25 up to the nearest half second. We also have an all-red that

1 we calculate very similar to a city formula used by Los
2 Angeles. So we have added a lot of safety factor. But I am
3 aware that some other professionals are probably not
4 following those and I think we should have a discussion
5 about what is reasonable. The yellow lights that we use
6 have been in effect for awhile and I think they have
7 improved safety. As well there are other issues that
8 improve safety such as having improved signal visibility so
9 every intersection has to be properly engineered before
10 photo enforcement is considered.

11 So I do hope that the Committee can look at the
12 matter, make recommendations so that we don't have such wide
13 divergence of yellow timings, in California at least, and
14 also we don't have divergence of yellows for whether a
15 location is enforced or not. Thank you.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I have a question.
17 Your policy for yellow signal timing. That's a blanket
18 policy, am I correct, or do you treat your red light camera
19 locations differently?

20 MR. OLEA: No, we treat all our locations the
21 same. It's calculated by a formula so we want all locations
22 to have that additional safety factor.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Uniformity.

24 MR. OLEA: Uniformity. We do take a look at
25 higher accident locations to see if perhaps we need to add

1 an additional all-red phase based on certain accident
2 patterns, but uniformly we have gone and retimed all our
3 signals to be the higher, the higher yellow that is
4 required.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: We call that
6 engineering judgment.

7 MR. OLEA: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Hamid.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just a
10 question, you may not have the information off the top of
11 your head. How many signals do you have and how many of
12 them have red light cameras?

13 MR. OLEA: We have about 1,200 traffic signals and
14 about 30 or so are photo enforced.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

16 MR. OLEA: We haven't expanded recently based on
17 our statistics being relatively stable. In San Francisco we
18 are not a growing city so a lot of our intersections are
19 relatively the same from year to year. But there's always
20 the issue that things can be safer and I think we should
21 strive to clarify this issue based on recent research.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Any?
23 Okay. Next. Thank you.

24 MR. BILLER: I had to look, it's still good
25 morning. I am Gary Biller, I am the President of the

1 National Motorists Association. I probably traveled here
2 from the furthest, I'm from Wisconsin, but we're a drivers
3 advocacy organization. We have -- we were founded over 30
4 years ago and we have several thousand members across the
5 United States. We have been very vocal for more than a
6 decade on the issue of yellow light timing and getting it
7 right and the potential abuse of marrying short yellow
8 lights with red light cameras. And so our members are very
9 keenly interested in this topic.

10 We have lobbied extensively in the local, state
11 and more recently the federal level. And the federal level
12 is a dialogue I started about a year ago with Bruce Friedman
13 of the Federal Highway Administration. It was triggered by
14 -- if you have ever butted heads -- or never butted heads --
15 you have never gone up against the City of Chicago
16 Department of Transportation. We have engaged them in
17 several different venues. And we are talking about -- and I
18 want to keep this on the engineering level because I think
19 that's critical for this committee.

20 In all of these discussions they turned to the
21 national MUTCD and the 3 to 6 second guidelines and said, we
22 are at 3.00 seconds. That's what we have always been,
23 that's what we are always going to be. Don't even look at
24 the ITE Kinematic Formula. And the net result in some --
25 what I remember is the gross result is that the City of

1 Chicago has annual revenue from red light camera tickets of
2 over \$72 million. It's huge, it's big business.

3 So in my conversations with Bruce Friedman, the
4 National Motorists Association is proud to have been
5 participating in the National Committee on Uniform Traffic
6 Control Devices and Bruce has invited us to apply to be a
7 sponsor and a voting member, because we do bring the
8 motorists' voice to the table.

9 What I want to do here though, and to kind of
10 supplement some of what has been talked about is to talk
11 about two of the input variables to the ITE Kinematic
12 Formula.

13 And I think, Devinder, you circulated my two page.

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, I did.

15 MR. BILLER: So I am going to hit the highlights
16 and not go through that in detail. I know there are some
17 more people that probably want to talk. And I do have one
18 more comment that's not in my written comments that I'll get
19 to too.

20 The first input variable for the ITE formula that
21 I want to talk about is the driver perception/reaction time.

22 As we know the ITE has long recommended that this variable
23 be set at 1.00 seconds. Report 731 which has been talked
24 about quite a bit, the data from last year, has actually
25 reaffirmed that the mean value of the perception time is

1 1.00. But of course that means about 50 percent of the
2 drivers have a slower perception/reaction time than that.

3 And we looked at the data and saw that one
4 standard deviation from that mean is 0.37 seconds. So the
5 NMA has been lobbying hard for an adoption, instead of the
6 traditional 1.0 seconds that you input into the formula, to
7 use 1.4 seconds. And that is also in recognition,
8 regardless of how automated or how smart we get in 20 years
9 going forward, the fact is that the baby boomer generation
10 has long been designated the most mobile generation, not in
11 terms of texting or tweeting, but as far as driving. And if
12 everything goes as planned, I'll be there in 15 or 20 years.

13 And there's going to be tens of millions of senior drivers
14 with slower perception reaction times and I think it's
15 prudent to look at this 1.4 value.

16 I will add it partly to the discussion about do we
17 have uniform practices across all signalized intersections,
18 not just those with red light cameras. We were pleased to
19 see that the Florida Department of Transportation recently
20 announced that they have adopted the 1.4 value for
21 perception/reaction time. And the way they're doing is they
22 have -- for communities that have red light camera
23 intersections, those intersections must be reevaluated using
24 the 1.4 perception time, looking at their yellow light
25 timing, by the end of this year. Then all other signalized

1 intersections across the state must be looked at the same
2 way using 1.4. And be brought up to speed -- I guess that's
3 a pun -- by the middle of 2015. So they are not going to --
4 eventually they are not going to draw a differentiation
5 between the two types of intersections, with or without red
6 light cameras.

7 The other variable is the approach speed of
8 vehicles. As we have talked about, the California MUTCD
9 allows the posted speed limit. Looking at Report 731, again
10 with more current data, and the fact that -- and they used
11 extensively a lot of Southern California sampling data --
12 found that the mean speed of approach speed for
13 intersections was typically several miles per hour over the
14 actual posted speed.

15 So we are in line with the recommendation of the
16 authors of the research, and that is that we would like to
17 see the California MUTCD upgraded to not just using the
18 posted speed but to use either the tried and true 85th
19 percentile speed data or use the posted speed plus at least
20 7 miles per hour. Now, the 7 miles per hour would add about
21 a half a second to the yellow. If you add -- take the half
22 a second and the 0.4 seconds I talked about for the
23 perception/ reaction time, it's 0.9 seconds more than the
24 current yellow.

25 The reason that we strongly endorse Assemblyman

1 Nazarian's bill AB 612 adding the one second is because the
2 technical background for it supports that, the .9 versus the
3 1.0 In an ideal world we wouldn't need legislation to do
4 this, it would be based on engineering criteria. And that's
5 what we're looking, hopefully, for the Committee to do.

6 I mentioned I was going to add one comment. In
7 looking at some of the material that was distributed to the
8 Committee Members with this discussion item I noticed that a
9 claim that we are seeing more and more frequently surfaced.
10 And that is that if the yellow light times are increased
11 drivers are going to adjust and they are still going to
12 aggressively go at red light -- attack red light
13 intersections.

14 When I have been faced with that directly I have
15 asked the person, where did you get that information? And I
16 have never gotten a direct answer on where that premise came
17 from. so let me go on the opposite side and tell you why
18 that isn't true. And I want to read -- it will just take a
19 second and then I'll be done; I'll read three quotes to you.

20 The first one is from the ITE Journal from
21 November 1980, from the authors Simpson, Zador and Tarnoff.
22 Quote: "The data show that the percentage of the last to
23 cross vehicles clearing the intersection at T+0.2 seconds or
24 more past the yellow onset was not appreciably changed by
25 the extension of the yellow."

1 More recently, 19 -- well, a little bit more
2 recently, 1985, an ITE quote: "Research has consistently
3 shown that drivers do not, in fact, adapt to the length o
4 the yellow."

5 And then lastly, and this goes back just a few
6 years ago, mid-2000s, Bonneson/Zimmerman was cited before
7 for the Texas Transportation Institute, quote: "Drivers do
8 adapt to the increase in yellow duration. However, this
9 adaptation does not undo the benefit of an increase in
10 yellow duration."

11 So again, on an engineering basis, if here is a
12 counter-claim that drivers do adapt. And Jay Beeber showed
13 a lot of data from cities that showed over time with cameras
14 still up after the longer yellow they didn't rebound, we'd
15 like to see it. But we have not yet and we have seen to the
16 contrary, the data shows.

17 So thank you for your time and appreciate your
18 relooking at this issue.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you very much.

20 Any questions? Thanks a lot.

21 Anyone else? Please come up.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: While he is on his way
23 can I just check in?

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Absolutely.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Take the temperature

1 of the group. Do I need to contact our lunch place and let
2 them know anything?

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Let's move to one
4 o'clock maybe.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: One o'clock?

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay, I'll give them a
8 call.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thanks.
10 Good afternoon.

11 MR. WIDSTRAND: Good afternoon. My name is Eric
12 Widstrand, I am Vice President and General Manager of the
13 Los Angeles office for Sam Schwartz Engineering. I am a
14 registered professional civil engineer, traffic engineer and
15 a certified professional traffic operations engineer. Prior
16 to joining Sam Schwartz two years ago I was a city traffic
17 engineer for Seattle, Washington, where we successfully used
18 red light cameras to reduce collisions at those locations
19 and continued to use engineering judgment in setting our
20 signal timing.

21 I wanted to talk this morning -- I appreciate the
22 Committee's discussion about using the continued use of
23 engineering judgment. I think as has been said today by
24 many people, the main factor we want to be considering is
25 safety. And that is the ultimate goal of our profession,

1 the ultimate goal of what we should be doing in setting our
2 signal timing. I think safety comes from providing
3 consistency. I think it is not random, it is not providing
4 an arbitrary number, it's developed through using
5 engineering judgment.

6 I think that there have been studies done that
7 show that just increasing yellow times do increase
8 collisions. NCHRP 705, which used data from California, San
9 Diego and San Francisco, that showed a 14 percent increase
10 in all crashes by extending the yellow time, a 7 percent
11 increase in injury and fatal crashes, and an 8 percent
12 increase in angle crashes. So it is not something to be
13 taken lightly to just randomly extend it.

14 I think that engineering judgment is the way to do
15 it. And whether that is using 85th percentile as was
16 recommended in NCHRP 713 -- and Richard Rettig is a
17 colleague of mine at Sam Schwartz. He was the co-author on
18 that and has done some previous safety work in that field --
19 or whether it's using a combination of factors. I
20 appreciate the Committee is still looking at these factors
21 moving forward and allowing further discussion. Thank you.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

23 I thought I saw another hand back in the back.
24 Rock.

25 MR. MILLER: Just a few comments I'd like to make

1 on this. I recognize although I am an alternate to the
2 Committee I am not with a public agency. I therefore don't
3 always appreciate the concerns of burden of having to do
4 things because of changes this committee may or may not do.

5 I am really very interested in safety and I've
6 heard that spoken many times by the members of the
7 Committee.

8 You know, I have no doubt that increasing yellows
9 reduces the frequency of running red lights, that's pretty
10 logical to assume that. I really keep on asking myself the
11 question, can we optimize safety through the proper approach
12 to managing our yellow indications.

13 Every once in a while you hear a little bit of
14 evidence that somebody increased yellows and they got a
15 safety benefit. That tends to not be the dominant opinion.

16 For every study that says that you'll find another one that
17 doesn't say that. Individual studies are always subject to
18 some of the limitations of small sample size by a selection
19 set at the start and really not a knowledge of what else
20 might have been done at the location to produce safety. But
21 when I see a 50 percent safety benefit in an intersection
22 from lengthening a yellow, I'm saying, well there just
23 aren't that many accidents out there to get a 50 percent
24 benefit for something as simple as that. I have a feeling
25 there is something in that study we don't know.

1 What it comes down to is I think we could probably
2 spend hundreds of thousands of dollars researching, trying
3 to figure out how to optimize this. But I think that NCHRP
4 study was really the federal government's attempt to really
5 start studying that issue from more of an academic
6 perspective where they can get around the biases of small
7 sample sizes, get around some of the other biases that
8 happen. Then they produce information in there which we can
9 kind of look at. Well here is a chart that kind of
10 demonstrates my position, well here is a chart that
11 demonstrates my position.

12 What I really end up wanting to look at in a study
13 like that is what did they recommend? Because I think that
14 is the information that is the best value to us based upon
15 their position to be able to commit a lot of resources to a
16 large sample size. That keeps coming back to some of the
17 basic recommendations such as, if you don't know the 85th
18 percentile use posted plus 7 miles an hour. That's not that
19 complicated an approach to take. And I can't get away from
20 that. If I know the 85th percentile, I know the formula was
21 based on the 85th percentile. If I don't know the 85th
22 percentile, the best, well-funded research says I should add
23 7 percent to the existing speed limit.

24 I hear a lot of testimony, everything is in
25 compliance with the MUTCD. To me that means nothing. The

1 federal MUTCD says, anywhere between 3 and 6 seconds, and we
2 heard how Chicago uses that. Our state MUTCD says, start
3 with the 85th percentile, but prior to 2006 we could round
4 that down by 9 miles an hour. After 2006 we can only round
5 it down by 7 miles an hour, but if it was established before
6 that date we could still keep it in there by 9 miles an
7 hour. That all bothers me. So when I hear, compliant with
8 the MUTCD, I am not hearing, compliant with the 85th
9 percentile, I am hearing, compliant with something that may
10 or may not be right.

11 I keep coming back, as I said before, I really
12 think if the NCHRP study is pointing towards adding 7 miles
13 an hour to the posted limit if you don't know the 85th
14 percentile, I think that's the way we should go.

15 Now if you do choose to study this further, no
16 surprise, I would be happy to help with those efforts. I
17 think there probably is some data that could be collected in
18 the state without spending too much money on the
19 effectiveness of, you know, these changes on collisions and
20 things like that.

21 I don't know where you're going, I'm hearing a lot
22 of opinions here and I'm kind of thinking maybe you are
23 going towards further study. Thank you very much.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Rock.

25 Bill.

1 MR. WINTER: Bill Winter, Los Angeles County
2 Public Works. I really don't have anything to add. I think
3 it has all been very well stated by the Committee.

4 In some ways this discussion, it's less a debate
5 and more a little bit of therapy. Trying to, you know,
6 reconcile how all of our practices as engineers, you know,
7 how we have reconciled that and kind of benchmarking
8 ourselves with others as we're hearing how they're doing it
9 as well.

10 I think this is a great opportunity in that sense
11 to take that discussion forward to the audience that isn't
12 here, our peers as engineers that aren't in this room, to
13 communicate some of the results of these studies, some of
14 what is being heard here today.

15 I did find it interesting though, one other note
16 just to end on is the discussion of speed limits. While the
17 use, the accepted use of the 85th percentile in setting a
18 radar-enforced speed limit, you know, realizing that that
19 still criminalizes 15 percent of your population. You know,
20 we as engineers, we have criminalized 15 percent of the
21 population driving the road. Not all of them -- we
22 recognize not all of them are being cited for their
23 exceeding the speed limit. In the case of automated
24 enforcement, as was stated by some of the members, that's
25 not always the case. It seems like there is a consistency

1 in that enforcement or that citation being done.

2 So it really depends on the metric you are using
3 here. If you are talking about safety and the metric that
4 we have traditionally used is collisions and reduction of
5 collisions, or if you're talking about the reduction in the
6 number of citations. You know, that may be another
7 discussion of how any kind of other study would choose to
8 compare that kind of a metric.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

10 Anyone else?

11 Seeing none we will bring the discussion back in
12 to -- oh, I'm sorry.

13 ASSEMBLYMAN NAZARIAN: Well thank you. First and
14 foremost I wanted to take a moment briefly and say, good
15 afternoon. Thank you to the Chair and the Committee Members
16 as well as all the attendees for traversing from all over,
17 especially from Wisconsin as well to be here for this issue.

18 I've got to say, when I introduced this bill as a
19 freshman member of the Assembly, the state Legislature, in a
20 year given that we have tremendous challenges facing, you
21 know, the opening -- the impending opening of the Panama
22 Canal and all the challenges that that's going to be putting
23 us with dealing with our transportation infrastructure and
24 being competitive with them, as well as implementing a
25 national mandated health care system, as well as changing a

1 education funding formula, which as you all know education
2 is half of the state's budget. You know, I never thought a
3 -- what would seem to me a fairly simple solution would have
4 caused so much of an issue. So thank you very much for this
5 humbling experience and for --

6 (Laughter.)

7 ASSEMBLYMAN NAZARIAN: -- for allowing me the
8 benefit of learning so much about this. So I wanted to -- I
9 have a prepared statement that I want to read pointing out
10 some of the arguments that we have all already heard quite a
11 bit about.

12 But I also wanted to take a moment to first of all
13 say thank you very much to everyone's thoughtfulness and
14 interest in this issue. We all have our various
15 organizations, constituencies, but I am here on behalf of my
16 residents and my constituents, who whether they vote for me
17 or outside of my jurisdiction, immediate jurisdiction, look
18 at me and my fellow 79 colleagues as their regulators and
19 their governors and their policy makers.

20 I never, for once, wanted to play engineer god by
21 suggesting what we what we need to do, whether in placing
22 one second or whatever that number was. What was most
23 important to me was to raise this issue and talk about the
24 importance of a dynamic society that has not been keeping up
25 -- unfortunately some components of our jurisdictions or

1 maybe overall view of the issue has not kept up with the
2 dynamic changes that have been taking place. And that's,
3 that's just human nature and that's what we learn as trying
4 to best serve our constituents and our public, by changing
5 and constantly staying in tune with the dynamic needs that
6 come about.

7 So with that I wanted to say thank you to Michael,
8 Mr. Robinson, for pointing out the issue of the collision
9 reduction. For me that has been -- this has all been in the
10 name of public safety.

11 And just as a brief, historical background, by the
12 way, I was a young staffer or deputy working for an LA City
13 Councilman back in 2001-2004, during which time I would go
14 to community meetings and gatherings and advocate for the
15 idea of bringing in red light cameras. LA instituted the
16 red light cameras back in 2002 or 2003. I'm sure there are
17 some engineers here from LA who would correct me on that if
18 I'm wrong. But I specifically remember going to various
19 neighborhood council or homeowner association meetings and
20 discussing the virtues of, let's utilize this public safety
21 measure. And at that time it was the best thing since
22 sliced bread and it was, it was a very easy victory for
23 everyone involved.

24 But again, with time and with the opportunity to
25 actually view a collection of database and information of

1 what we have been able to gather in the course of the last
2 ten years -- I am not advocating getting rid of the program
3 whatsoever, even though the City of LA, the two largest
4 cities in California, two of the five largest cities in
5 California have already done away with the program, a third
6 one is impending.

7 But that is not my goal with this. My goal,
8 purely and succinctly -- and I can probably even end with
9 this but I still want to read my technical points.

10 (Laughter.)

11 ASSEMBLYMAN NAZARIAN: Was all in the name of --
12 we took a great step in making sure that we put the fear of
13 God in those driving, utilizing the privilege of driving on
14 the streets and making sure that they are careful as they
15 are taking all the other motorists' lives as well as theirs
16 into their hands.

17 Yet this measure has become so punitive in some
18 ways, without offering any type of a caveat or a recourse or
19 some measure of allowing someone who falls into that zone,
20 the dilemma zone, for example, for a term of a better -- at
21 least whatever term I am going to use, a better use of my
22 term. To have that opportunity to engage the intersection
23 in a safe way.

24 I maybe don't understand the comments of Mr. Jones
25 but delaying the implementation of the camera by half a

1 second or whatever duration from the time the light turns
2 red. Again, maybe I misunderstand this, but in my view that
3 wasn't a safety measure that I would want to see. My whole
4 goal, again, was just to make sure that if collision is
5 reduced there is no question, in my mind at least, that
6 after implementing the red light cameras collisions did
7 decrease. But at the same time we want to make sure that
8 the public isn't paying a certain price either. That they
9 are receiving the benefit of also not only traversing in
10 safer streets but also making sure that they have the
11 opportunity to be able to negotiate passing through an
12 intersection as well. So I will still hold steadfast to my
13 argument of why I think extending the yellow light is the
14 better way.

15 So with that I think I touched on all the points
16 at least that I wanted to briefly, that briefly I wanted to
17 address given the comments that I heard. So with that I
18 will just take a couple of minutes and offer you some of the
19 thoughts and argument for why I am here.

20 I don't know how many members of the state
21 legislature appear before you make a plea on their case but
22 thank you. I felt that this was important enough for me to
23 be here. And also to -- I very much appreciate the length
24 and depth that many folks have gone through to present their
25 case and present statistics. I heard from two individuals'

1 comments about how challenging -- how there will be
2 accidents if there are increased yellow time lines, without
3 offering much of a background for it. I don't know if there
4 is information I'm missing. I'm happy to look into that
5 later on.

6 But I introduced this bill, got it passed through
7 a bipartisan effort, a 72-0 vote in the Assembly. Went into
8 the Senate, at which point in conversations with various
9 committee members I decided that instead of forcing through
10 a mandate, a legislative mandate -- which I agree, I am not
11 crazy about that myself. Because again, trends will change
12 and we might need to then look at changing the legislation
13 that will be passed now or was to be passed.

14 So my goal wasn't to just legislatively find a
15 fix. I think we have done that in the state far too often
16 and sometimes have legislated ourselves into a corner. I
17 would much rather see the engineers come to a conclusion
18 that benefits our public transportation users.

19 So with that what I did was I extended my bill
20 into -- I made my bill into a two year bill so that it would
21 appear before you, passing my legislative deadlines in the
22 Senate, so that -- so that I was forced to make it into a
23 two year bill. To make sure that you as the deciding
24 advisory organization and the engineers that you represent
25 actually take the time into hopefully coming to a conclusion

1 that will be in agreement with what I am trying to advocate
2 for on behalf of my constituents.

3 So with that said, in an effort to promote traffic
4 safety and ensure that drivers have enough time to clear a
5 problem intersections I request the California Traffic
6 Control Devices Committee to compose a report that analyzes
7 the benefits of adding time to the minimum yellow light
8 change interval at intersections equipped with traffic
9 enforcement cameras.

10 I also request the study to include a report on
11 the benefits and differences between using 85th percentile
12 speed, posted speed or an alternative method to define
13 approach speed.

14 Several studies have noted that lengthening the
15 minimum yellow light change interval above the required
16 minimum will reduce violations, collisions and reflect the
17 actual speed of flowing traffic. Most notably, a study
18 conducted by the Texas Transportation Institute, which was
19 shown a while ago, showed a 40 percent decrease in
20 collisions after yellow time increased by one second above
21 the computed duration, which is the minimum time as
22 calculated by the Institute of Transportation Engineers'
23 Kinematic Formula.

24 It is also important to note that the 85th
25 percentile approach speed was used by the Texas

1 Transportation Institute to come up with the computed
2 duration. In contrast, California uses the posted speed
3 limit.

4 A recent study by National Cooperative Highway
5 Research Program concluded that the actual 85th percentile
6 approach speed should be used in the kinematic equation.
7 However, if the field data is not available, an estimation
8 of 7 miles per hour above the posted speed limit is an
9 acceptable alternative.

10 As mentioned, California utilizes the posted speed
11 limit and not the actual speed of approaching traffic to
12 determine the minimum yellow change interval. In fact, as
13 the California Traffic Control Devices Committee noted in
14 your agenda, because the posted speed limit sometimes is 9
15 miles below the 85th percentile speed, the minimum yellow
16 light change interval time calculated on the posted speed
17 limit, which is reduced 9 miles from the 85th percentile,
18 could create a trap for drivers approaching the intersection
19 during the change in signal phasing.

20 The latest research supported by engineering
21 experts and data presented in the National Cooperative
22 Highway Research Program report states that the 85th
23 percentile speed is suggested as the most appropriate
24 measure of approach speed. It is clear that California's
25 standards are not up to par to the latest research, and

1 using the posted speed limit rather than 85th percentile
2 speed, is outdated and potentially unsafe.

3 In addition, recognizing the benefits of extending
4 yellow light intervals above the required minimum, local
5 jurisdictions and the state of Georgia have increased their
6 yellow light timing. In 2010 the state of Georgia added one
7 additional second, which you already heard, to the yellow
8 light times at photo enforced intersections, and within 90
9 days red light running violations dropped 72 percent at red
10 light camera intersections.

11 In addition, the California city of Loma Linda saw
12 a 90 percent decrease in violations after the city increased
13 yellow time by one second above the state minimum. As shown
14 and discussed, the state minimum is out of date and does not
15 reflect optimum time to increase safety.

16 Based on the benefits mentioned I respectfully
17 request that your Committee evaluate this issue by creating
18 a subcommittee to report back to the entire California --
19 again, your committee, with findings and recommendations by
20 the next quarterly meeting.

21 I request to participate in these discussions, I
22 or my staff, and actively engage with the subcommittee.

23 With that I, again, wanted to say thank you for
24 allowing me to speak and for all of your great interest in
25 this issue and I look forward to working with you all, thank

1 you.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

3 I think we've heard quite a little bit of
4 discussion today on this, probably as much as we're going to
5 get. Once we -- once we get past a certain point we all
6 start repeating ourselves and it's not -- it's not efficient
7 for us to do that.

8 I think we are at a point where we may want to
9 start talking about how to, how to tackle this. We've got a
10 lot of information up here and it's -- some of it is pretty
11 eye-opening. I think maybe one of the things that we should
12 just take a second or two on is do --

13 A subcommittee seems to be a good idea. The
14 Assemblyman is interested in that. And I think based on
15 everything that I'm hearing we've got the makings of a good
16 review for a smaller group of people. We could sit and
17 debate for quite a while what should go into the findings
18 and what shouldn't but the bottom line is a smaller group of
19 people will probably more efficiently get to the bottom line
20 faster. So, Hamid.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman,
22 thank you for everyone who shared their views with us.

23 If I can make the analogy of a criminal
24 proceedings. This was the preliminary hearing. And the
25 evidence, at least the way it was presented to me, warranted

1 in my mind further discussion and further review. Where
2 that may lead us, as you said, that's going to be up to a
3 group of people who are going to focus on these, go through
4 this information and look at every piece, look at the
5 implications of changes. I hear a lot like, for example,
6 posted-plus-7. If you do posted-plus-7 you always end up
7 with a 2 because it's going to be 35 plus 7, 42. You go to
8 the table, there is no value for 42, things like that. So a
9 lot of discussions.

10 But at a minimum I thought that, as Mr. Nazarian
11 also said, that maybe we have not caught up as a profession
12 with a dynamic society. And our technology has shown us
13 that maybe the way that we are doing things are not the best
14 way of doing it. We would not have had this information
15 without so many red light cameras all over California. Now
16 the red light cameras, thanks to the red light cameras, we
17 are seeing that a very small change in the yellow timing can
18 significantly, significantly reduce the number of red light
19 runnings. And red light runnings are what causes red light
20 accidents, so instinctively you say, I am reducing red light
21 running violations, I must be improving traffic safety.

22 You can argue and go to research and do all kinds
23 of stuff. But at this point what I would like to ask my
24 colleagues on the Committee is to at least acknowledge that
25 this issue needs further evaluation. That we can do better.

1 Our technology, the data, the latest research from NCHRP,
2 everything points to us being able to do better. How we can
3 do better, that we can discuss but I support the idea of a
4 subcommittee.

5 And again like previous time I suggest that we
6 even expand the subcommittee beyond the membership of this
7 committee for the experts who know these things better than
8 -- much better than I do or I will ever learn. Like the
9 nuances of signal timing, human behavior. We have very good
10 human behavior scientists who can help us with this. And
11 obviously in this specific case, a member of the legislative
12 who has already offered his staff to work with us on this.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay, thank you.

14 Is there anybody here who would disagree with the
15 creation of a subcommittee to review this? If not then I
16 think we are all in agreement that that should happen.

17 Larry, another comment?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yeah, just a quick
19 one. I'm glad I waited until after the public comment
20 because the comments were very helpful. But I'd agree. I'd
21 only put one little -- just a clarification. Because
22 obviously, we are not going to be in a position, especially
23 if we try to set a quarter of time, a three month time to
24 basically look at this. It is not going to be a research
25 study, it is going to be a review of the information that is

1 available to us and I like that idea.

2 I think a couple of things I'd like to just
3 comment on since the criminal reference was brought up. Our
4 individual from I think LA County, right Bill? I think he
5 was the one that said that we've criminalized 15 percent of
6 the population. But I think if you go back to the setting
7 of 85th percentile it will say, 85 percent of the people
8 will drive at a safe and reasonable speed for the
9 conditions. And so those that we're criminalizing deserve
10 to be criminalized, you know.

11 (Laughter.)

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: So I think the other
13 -- I like the idea of setting up a committee, I'd support
14 that idea. And at least making sure we've taken a careful
15 look at the NCHRP research, And even the presentation
16 recognizes that 60 percent of the problem may be inside the
17 85th percentile speed as opposed to posted speed so I think
18 that's worth a conversation.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: As the Chairman who
20 is stepping down after a year, only a year of service in
21 this position, and understanding that the Vice Chairman
22 typically will pick up for the slack that I'm leaving, I
23 would prefer to I think leave the composition of the
24 committee more in his hands since he is going to be working
25 with that group. And I am hearing that he is interested in

1 perhaps a committee that is comprised of a few members on
2 CTCDC as well as a few of the public at large. Are there --
3 are there members here who have a particular interest in
4 spending some additional time working on this issue?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I would.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Larry.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: And there will be
8 representation from Caltrans.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Caltrans, okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I want
11 to essentially volunteer to not be, and I have a particular
12 reason. Not that I am not willing to help but my presence
13 here, I am representing one of the more rural agencies on
14 the Committee and this is really not our wheel house. And
15 candidly, my alternate on the Committee is from a county
16 that is just as rural as mine so I don't think we are the
17 most advantageous people to include. I will certainly
18 continue to stay current and do my part but I don't think we
19 are really the strength that this group needs.

20 I am hoping that I could potentially put Bill on
21 the spot. I'm hoping Bill will be willing to be a voice for
22 counties on this because I think he would bring a lot of
23 value to this.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Mr. Chairman?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Yes.

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Subcommittee is going
2 to be lead by one person so they are called Chairman,
3 Chairman for the Subcommittee. Hamid last time chaired that
4 subcommittee so maybe, you know, it's better Hamid can lead
5 again.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Hamid, is it
7 something that you would be interested in doing?

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You know
9 what --

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Chairing a
11 subcommittee.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I would be
13 happy to do that. Last time our effort was successful. It
14 took long. And I want to echo what Larry just said, this is
15 not going to happen in two months. It's going to take
16 longer, so that everybody knows. And those who are
17 volunteering, last time just to give you an idea, we had
18 about I think five meetings and the shortest one was by
19 phone. A lot of people participated by phone. The shortest
20 one was two hours, the longest one was about four and a half
21 hours. So that's the kind of commitment that it's going to
22 take those of you who are volunteering.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: So far we have --
24 and I'll get right with you, John. So far we have Caltrans,
25 we have Larry, we have Hamid and we have Bill.

1 Yes, Zaki?

2 MR. MUSTAFA: Do you have city of LA represented?

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I'm sorry?

4 MR. MUSTAFA: Is city of Los Angeles represented?

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: City of LA?

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Let's start with
7 areas. So Bill will -- Bill, you will be working with the
8 committee?

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Bill is county of
10 LA. We have Caltrans.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The city of LA
12 last time, of course we had John Fisher on the committee.
13 But city of LA we always include in issues like this because
14 they pretty much have 12 percent of all the state's signals.
15 They have 4,300 traffic signals.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: If you're in
17 agreement to that then I'm fine with it.

18 And then we want -- we also want to make sure that
19 we have the public at large. Mr. Beeber? Is everybody okay
20 with that? Everybody is in agreement?

21 (Affirmative responses.)

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And also last
24 time we had two consultants, two traffic engineering
25 consultants.

1 MR. MILLER: I already volunteered.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So Rock Miller.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Is there anyone else
4 who may not be here that we can -- that we think would be a
5 good idea?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: There will be
7 representation from Caltrans. Do I need to name them now or
8 do I -- can I --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I think just
10 Caltrans is good enough.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Okay.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: All right. So I
13 think we have a pretty good core for your subcommittee. Is
14 there -- do you think we've got enough? You've probably got
15 one or two others that you might want to --

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yeah. We may
17 -- just for a suggestion, last time we expanded it to
18 traffic engineers of, maybe like for example, City of Long
19 Beach. They don't have representation but they were -- if
20 the members of the cities -- the League. One of the members
21 of the League here think that they adequately speak for all
22 the cities. But if you want to add a couple of your
23 colleagues we --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I would like to
25 suggest, I am hearing that San Francisco has a red light

1 program. Is there anybody who we have picked so far that --
2 is there anybody else that we have picked so far that is
3 running a red light program? You're running one? Okay.
4 You're Northern California, it would be great to have you on
5 board as well.

6 MR. OLEA: We can participate, the City and County
7 of San Francisco.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: In terms of what
10 Hamid said, I can certainly add to the conference call that
11 we have with the League of Cities and ask if there are any
12 who have a traffic engineering background who would like to
13 -- and signal timing in particular that would like to
14 participate on the committee. And if there are I can at
15 least present those to Hamid and you can decide as the chair
16 whether you need them or not.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Obviously
18 Assemblyman Nazarian's office, you're welcome to attend,
19 participate and go as far or as little as you'd like.

20 MR. BEEBER: May I just offer that there are some
21 experts in the field who you may want to reach out to. I am
22 obviously not volunteering them, but some of the authors of
23 some of these studies, Dr. Karl Zimmerman or Dr. Peter
24 Parsonson who has been an expert and an expert witness. So
25 just to look. And there may be some other people outside of

1 this group who have been experts in the field for many
2 decades.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

4 We do owe the Senate Committee on Transportation
5 and Housing a response based on what we have gone through
6 today. SO I think our response is basically going to be
7 that we've determined that there is a need to look at this
8 in greater detail and that we are setting up a subcommittee
9 that is comprised of professionals in the various
10 appropriate fields that can get to the bottom of this. And
11 their task will be to move as quickly as possible to make
12 recommendations back to this Committee.

13 John, I apologize, I am not -- I am not trying to
14 ignore you.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I emphatically do
16 not want to be on the subcommittee, I think there are people
17 far more qualified than I. But I want to state my concern
18 as one of the two representatives for non-motorized issues.

19 The main concern I have is unintended consequences. I
20 trust that those who have been named already will be more
21 than capable of addressing this.

22 But one of the key things that is of importance
23 for non-motorized user safety is the -- and to the extent
24 that one unintended consequence of a change in timing of
25 whatever nature in signals might lead to creeping increases

1 in the actual speeds in a city, especially on the busiest
2 streets, that's a big issue for non-motorized safety.
3 Because as we all know. collision impact is a square of
4 velocity. A little bit of increase in speed is a big
5 increase in impact velocity.

6 I look forward to tracking the results and to
7 digging in my own -- increasing my own understanding about
8 the fine point of how you do this and what the consequences
9 might be. But I am particularly concerned that someone
10 might be led to clear the intersection at a higher speed or
11 to make a left turn at a higher speed. Especially at a
12 large intersection, it's possible to make a very large
13 radius left turn. If someone is led to do that a pedestrian
14 can be put at jeopardy.

15 Not everybody obeys the letter of the law, both in
16 terms of 85th percentile, but also in terms of when they're
17 present in the street. And so be careful of putting the
18 people that aren't quite complying with crosswalk law in
19 jeopardy because something that you have done with an
20 equation leads more people to legally travel faster.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Duly noted. And I
22 trust that you will hold the subcommittee to task by the
23 appropriate questions as they come back and report.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: John, if there is
25 anyone who wants to volunteer just give me the name, I will

1 be making the final list for the --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think with Rock
3 Miller on the committee --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: On that same -- on
5 that same note. One thing that wasn't discussed today was
6 the potential for what happens when we do increase yellow
7 time? And one piece that wasn't talked about today is the
8 environment and what additional delay does to some of the
9 more smoggy areas of our state. And we may want to touch on
10 that too as we're going through it.

11 Bryan?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And Assemblyman, I just
13 wanted to say that the only reason why I approached it from
14 a different perspective is that it was being brought to my
15 attention from a red light violation standpoint or citation
16 standpoint. And if the citation was the nemesis for coming
17 forward then how we write a citation could be a
18 consideration. Because what I was seeing is the statistics
19 were, you know, tenths of seconds for motorists making
20 mistakes, or humanistic characteristics or behaviors were
21 causing a significant financial burden on people. And if
22 that was the case that's not how we enforce it with our law
23 enforcement to the same degree and that's why I was
24 proposing or suggesting that that might be another
25 consideration.

1 I do -- I do, you know -- I think a couple of very
2 important things have come out of this discussion. One is
3 that our profession became very stagnant from the 1960s.
4 And no disrespect to our grandfathers and grandmothers in
5 our profession but we did not stay dynamic with the changing
6 times. And we did a study in 1959 that we're relying on in
7 2013. And cars have increased their antilock brakes in that
8 time, cars have implemented seat belt laws in that time,
9 cars have implemented child care restraints in that time,
10 airbags.

11 All these improvements have been done to cars but
12 every year 36,000 people die on our roadways. And why are
13 they dying? A lot of it is the result of speed on our
14 roadways. And speed is the number one contributor. And 93
15 percent of our collisions that occur in the United States
16 are the result of human errors.

17 And we as a profession haven't done much -- as a
18 transportation profession haven't done much to improve
19 safety in that same time period as the automotive industry
20 has done.

21 And I would encourage -- and I wrote an article or
22 a blog on it called The Transportation Profession as
23 Visionary. That if you look it up, the San Diego American
24 Planning Association highlighted it. But it really talks
25 about we as an organization need to start looking at -- you

1 know, we have local jurisdictions applying freeway lane
2 widths because they are designing roadways for semi-trucks,
3 even though semi-trucks only make up two percent of our
4 traffic. And yet when you have a passenger car that is only
5 six feet wide, they feel very safe to drive 10 or 15 miles
6 over a safe speed limit. And when you have the difference
7 between a 10 mile per hour -- or a 20 mile per hour car and
8 a 40 mile per hour car, a pedestrian or a bicyclist in a
9 collision with that has almost zero chance of surviving that
10 collision.

11 And so when we look at some of those speed things
12 we need to be looking as a profession as a holistic approach
13 on how do we make our roadways safer. And if that means
14 going back and revisiting some of the basic assumptions that
15 our forefathers and foremothers made 50 years ago or 60
16 years ago when the largest public works infrastructure
17 project was underway to build the freeway system and many of
18 those people gravitated toward local jurisdictions. But our
19 intersections and roadways are getting bigger and faster and
20 wider and as a result they, in some cases, are becoming more
21 dangerous because we are relying on humans to do the right
22 thing and humans don't always do the right thing.

23 And so I would just encourage -- then we need to
24 supplement it with enforcement but there is not 24 hour
25 enforcement. But then we do technology with traffic red

1 light running cameras and we have 24 hour enforcement and
2 then we get some data.

3 But we have a lot going on in our profession and I
4 think as a profession we need to be more progressive and
5 more dynamic and less set in our ways and look for ways to
6 rethink about how our roadways are designed and striped and
7 signed because we still have 36,000 people every year and
8 that number is not going down very quickly. And that
9 equates to four -- just to put it in -- that equates to four
10 Newtown Massacres every day on our roadways throughout the
11 United States. And we all saw how America responded to
12 Newtown's shooting, but in America we have more people dying
13 on our roadways than by gun and guns get so much more
14 attention than our roadways.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Bryan.

16 Unless there is any final word from anyone we are
17 going to consider this discussion closed, with the action
18 being as I previously stated, the letter that will go back
19 to the Senate Committee on Transportation and Housing.

20 We have set up the Committee, Hamid will chair it
21 and flesh it out as additional need arises.

22 And with that we will move on to our next agenda
23 item which should be very quick, it is a discussion item on
24 Blank-out Stop or Yield signs for mid-block crosswalks. Do
25 you have just a quick note on that?

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Mr. Chairman, I put
2 this item on the agenda without even asking my supervisor.

3 (Laughter.)

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Are you in trouble?
5 You're in trouble now.

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So I am taking it off.
7 You know, we don't want any discussion on this item. We
8 will wait until efforts to come up with some language.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay, thank you.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It was nice
11 knowing you.

12 (Laughter.)

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Then our last item
14 will be confirming that our next meeting will be either
15 November 7th or 14th at the pleasure of this committee. Is
16 there one date that works better than the other for the
17 majority of you?

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: November 7th is
19 the day that will live in infamy.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: November 7th --

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Is Pearl
22 Harbor.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: -- is the incoming
24 chair.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's December

1 7th or November 7th?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN UNISON: December.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: The 7th is okay?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: November 7th is the
5 beginning of the California Bike Summit in Oakland, it's a
6 statewide conference in my field.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay.

8 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: The 14th?

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Is everyone okay
10 with the 14th?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: No.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Mark is not okay
13 with the 14th. Shall we arm wrestle?

14 (Laughter.)

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Let's stick with the
16 7th and we'll see if maybe John --

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Do you have an
18 alternate?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's a four-day
20 conference so it's not a show-stopper for me.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Do you have an
22 alternate then that can attend?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I do, yes.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay. So it will be
25 November 7th?

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And it is a Southern
3 California location.

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: TO be determined.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: To be determined by
6 Caltrans.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So it is
9 November 7th?

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: The 7th is not good
13 for either me or my alternate.

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: November 7th? Well,
15 we can move it to the last week of October.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay. So you want
17 to move it to the last week of October?

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Not Halloween. If
20 it is then we are all wearing costumes.

21 (Laughter.)

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Okay, let's find out
23 what it is.

24 (Several Committee Members discussing
25 meeting dates.)

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: How about the 24th?

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I'm not available the
3 24th.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Let's leave it on
5 the -- let's leave it on the 17th. And Bryan, if you will
6 invite your alternate.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: All right. And our
9 last item is to adjourn. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I make a motion
11 to adjourn the meeting and thanking you very much for your
12 chairmanship and leadership over the last year facilitating
13 our discussions. Thank you very much.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: And do we have a
15 second to that motion?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Second.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: We've got a motion
18 and a second. All in favor?

19 (Ayes.)

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Opposed?

21 We're adjourned, thank you.

22 (Thereupon, the meeting of the California
23 Traffic Control Devices Committee was
24 adjourned at 12:47 p.m.)

25 --oOo--

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Richard A. Friant, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Department of Transportation, California Traffic Control Devices Committee meeting; that it was thereafter transcribed.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting, nor in any way interested in the outcome of said matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of August, 2013.

RICHARD A. FRIANT, CER-D*479

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

RAMONA COTA, CERT**478

August 8, 2012